

**2001 NCAA  
CONVENTION  
PROCEEDINGS**

---

**95th Annual Convention**

---

**January 6-8, 2001**

---

**Orlando, Florida**

---

PROCEEDINGS



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 6222  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6222  
317/917-6222

**Edited By:** Michael V. Earle, *Publishing Manager.*

NCAA, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

# ■ 95th Annual Convention Delegates and Visitors

## Active Member Institutions

Abilene Christian University: Doug Conder, Sylvia Dyer, Gary McCaleb, David Merrell, Royce Money  
Adams State College: Jeffrey Geiser  
Adelphi University: Robert Hartwell  
Adrian College: Stanely Caine, Henry Mensing  
University of Akron: Mary Lu Gribshaw, David Jamison, Michael Thomas  
Alabama A&M University: Betty Austin, James Martin, William Head, James Smith  
University of Alabama at Birmingham: Herman Frazier  
University of Alabama, Huntsville: Jim Harris, Sheila Ray, Gary Smith, Brent Wren  
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa: Marie Robbins, Andrew Sorenson  
University of Alaska Anchorage: Dede Allen, Steve Cobb, Pershing J. Hill, Cynthia Matson  
University of Alaska Fairbanks: Rick Goeb, Karen Jones, Randy Pitney, Dani Raap  
State University of New York at Albany: Lee Mcelroy  
Albany State University (Georgia): Kenneth Dyer, Stephanie Harrison, Dan Land, Portia Shields  
Albertus Magnus College: Joseph Tonelli  
Albion College: Beth Lincoln, Michael Vanhouten  
Albright College: Sally Stetler  
Alcorn State University: Marino Casem, Robert Raines, Alecia Shield-Gasdon  
Alderson-Broaddus College: Jerrel Long  
Alfred University: Charles Edmondson, Karen Johnson, Jim Moretti  
Allegheny College: Richard Cook, Rick Creehan  
Alvernia College: Adam Hertz, Laurence Mazzeno, Sue Hansen, Jim Oppermann  
American International College: Robert Burke  
American University of Puerto Rico: Jose-Orlando Lopez, Juan Nazario-Negron  
Amherst College: Peter Gooding  
Anderson College (South Carolina): Harry Lehwald, Jason Moorhead  
Anderson University (Indiana): Barrett Bates, James Edwards, Becky Hull, Doyle Lucas  
Angelo State University: Kathleen Basfield, Kathleen Price, Michael Ryan, Jerry Vandergriff

Anna Maria College: Joseph Brady  
 Appalachian State University: Alan Hauser  
 University of Arizona: Dudley Woodward  
 Arizona State University: Vic Cegles, Jerry Kingston, Betsy Mosher,  
 Paul Ward  
 University of Arkansas, Fayetteville: Derrick Gragg, Beverly Lewis,  
 John White  
 University of Arkansas, Monticello: Peggy Doss, Fred Taylor,  
 Stephen Terrell  
 University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff: Vannette Johnson  
 Arkansas State University: Doug Abel  
 Arkansas Tech University: Gil Cloud  
 Armstrong Atlantic State University: Eddie Aenchbacher, Thomas  
 Jones, Will Lynch  
 Ashland University: William Benz, Bill Goldring, Mark Hamilton,  
 Sue Uebel  
 Assumption College: Rita Castagna, Kevin Hickey  
 Auburn University: Barbara Camp, Dennis Wilson  
 Augsburg College: Paul Grauer  
 Augusta State University: Clint Bryant, Mary Lisko  
 Augustana College (Illinois): Liesl Fowler  
 Augustana College (South Dakota): Bill Gross, Sandy Jerstad, Mel  
 Klein  
 Aurora University: Mark Walsh  
 Austin College: Tim Millerick, Oscar Page, Jack Pierce  
  
 Babson College: Francis Millerick  
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Louis Barone  
 Ball State University: John Reno, Andrea Seger  
 Bard College: Phil Roloson, Scott Swere  
 Barry University: Jean Cerra, Mike Covone, Kathy Turpin  
 Barton College: Gary Hall  
 Bates College: Suzanne Coffey, Marsha Graf  
 Baylor University: Mike Rogers  
 Beaver College: Stan Exeter, Bette Landman, Shirley Liddle  
 Bellarmine College: Ann Jirkovsky, David O'Toole  
 Belmont University: Heather Poor  
 Bemidji State University: Thomas Faecke  
 Benedictine University (Illinois): Jill Redmond, John Stachniak  
 Bennett College: Carl Bibbs, Gloria Scott  
 Bentley College: Sandy Hoffman  
 Bernard M. Baruch College: William Eng  
 Bethany College (West Virginia): Wallace Neel  
 Bethel College (Minnesota): David Klostreich  
 Bethune-Cookman College: Floyd Laisure, Robert O'Neal, Lynn  
 Thompson  
 Blackburn College: Mark Armstrong

Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania: Mary Gardner, Perston  
 Herring, Jessica Kozloff, Samuel Slike  
 Bluefield State College: Roy Pruitt  
 Bluffton College: Denny Weaver  
 Boston College: Gene DeFilippo  
 Bowdoin College: Jeffrey Ward  
 Bowie State University: Charles Davis  
 Brandeis University: Jeffrey Cohen, Sheryl Sousa  
 University of Bridgeport: Joe DiPuma  
 Bridgewater College (Virginia): Curtis Kendall, Phillip Stone  
 Bridgewater State College: John Harper, Michael Storey  
 Brigham Young University, Hawaii: Randy Day, Ronald Jackson, Eric  
 Shumway  
 State University College at Brockport: Linda Case, Mary Ann Giglio,  
 Susan Hoffman  
 Brooklyn College: Bruce Filosa  
 Brown University: David Roach  
 Bryant College: Dan Gavitt, John Ruppooert  
 Bryn Mawr College: Amy Campbell, Kathleen Miller, Nancy Vickers  
 Bucknell University: John Hardt  
 Buena Vista College: Peg Chown, Jan Travis, Marge Willadsen  
 State University of New York at Buffalo: Bob Arkeilpane  
 State University College at Buffalo: Jerry Boyes, Muriel Howard,  
 Gail Maloney, Hal Payne  
 Butler University: John Parry  
  
 C.W. Post Campus/Long Island University: Vincent Salamone  
 Cabrini College: Leslie Danehy  
 University of California, Davis: Pam Gill-Fisher, Mel Ramey, Greg  
 Warzecka, Sue Williams  
 University of California, Los Angeles: Betsy Stephenson  
 University of California, San Diego: Lea Rudee, Regina Sullivan,  
 Joseph Watson  
 California Institute of Technology: Timothy Downes, Mark Harriman  
 California Lutheran University: Bruce Bryde  
 California Polytechnic State University: John McCucheon  
 California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Dan Bridges,  
 Frank Gibbons  
 California State University, Bakersfield: Rudy Carvajal, Brian  
 McNamara  
 California State University, Chico: Anita Barker, Don Batie, Richard  
 Parker  
 California State University, Dominguez Hills: Hal Chaarnofsky, Ron  
 Prettyman, Julie Sandoval  
 California State University, Fresno: Al Bohl, Diane Milutinovich,  
 John Welty  
 California State University, Hayward: Douglas Weiss

California State University, Los Angeles: Gerald Beer, Carol Dunn,  
 Brian Swanson  
 California State University, Northridge: Annagrace Collins  
 California State University, San Bernardino: Nancy Simpson  
 California State University, Stanislaus: Kim Duyst, Wayne Pierce,  
 Milton Richards  
 Calvin College: Mary Flikkema, Nancy Meyer, Marvin Zuidema  
 Cameron University: Sam Carroll, Don Davis, Don Sullivan, Kim  
 Vinson, Robert Ziegler  
 Campbell University: Stan Williamson  
 Canisius College: Timothy Dillon, Jennifer Zeh  
 Capital University: Jane Baldwin, Roger Welsh  
 Carleton College: Leon Lunder  
 Carnegie Mellon University: John Harvey, Joan Maser  
 Carson-Newman College: Ross Brummett  
 Carthage College: Robert Bonn  
 Case Western Reserve University: David Hutter  
 Castleton State College: Deanna Tyson  
 Catawba College: Fred Corriher, Dennis Davidson, Karl Hales  
 Catholic University: Jone Dowd  
 Cazenovia College: Marvin Christopher  
 Centenary College (New Jersey): Stephanie Bennett-Smith, Billie Jo  
 Blackwell, Diane Finnan, John Latko  
 University of Central Arkansas: William Lide, John Smith, Winfred  
 Thompson, Darrell Walsh  
 Central College (Iowa): Bev Brand, Al Dorenkamp, Ed Willis  
 Central Connecticut State University: Michael Ansarra, Charles  
 Jones, Lisa Meyers  
 Central Missouri State University: Paul Englemann, Jerry Hughes,  
 Cindy Parks, Bobby Patton  
 University of Central Oklahoma: Jeff McKibbin, Charles  
 Stumbaugh, John Wagnon, W. Roger Webb  
 Central Washington University: Ethan Bergman, Jack Bishop  
 Centre College: Joe McDaniel, Gina Nicoletti, John Roush  
 Chadron State College: Thomas Krepel, Brad Smith  
 Chaminade University: Wayne Tanna  
 Chapman University: David Currey  
 Chatham College: Noreen O'Malley  
 Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: Clinton Pettus  
 University of Chicago: Starkey Duncan, Rosalie Resch, Lorna Straus,  
 Tom Weingartner  
 Chicago State University: Al Avant  
 Chowan College: Steven D. Lee  
 Christian Brothers University: Michael Daush, Joe Nadicksbernd  
 University of Cincinnati: Nancy Hamant  
 The Citadel: William Sharbrough  
 City College of New York: Robert J. Coleman

Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: Georgette Deveres, Michael Sutton  
 Clarion University of Pennsylvania: Bob Carlson, Tracey Cumming, Iseli Krauss  
 Clark Atlanta University: Edward Davis, Larry Nolley, Charles Ward  
 Clark University (Massachusetts): Linda Moulton  
 Clarke College: Curt Long  
 Clarkson University: Geoffrey Brown  
 Clayton College & State University: Mason Barfield, Thomas Harden  
 Coker College: Kaye Crook, Tim Griggs  
 Colby College: Marcella Zalot  
 Colby-Sawyer College: Debi McGrath, Kathryn Springsteen  
 University of Colorado, Boulder: Phil DiStefano, Karen Morrison, Richard Tharp  
 University of Colorado, Colorado Springs: Randy Cubero, Linda Shade  
 Colorado Christian University: Larry Donnithorne  
 Colorado College: Ralph Bertrand  
 Colorado School of Mines: John Hogan, Marvin Kay  
 Columbus State University: Frank Brown  
 Concord College: Ron Burgher  
 Concordia College, Moorhead: Armin Pipho  
 Concordia University (Illinois): Janet Fisher  
 Concordia University (Wisconsin): Paul Paynter  
 Concordia University at Austin: William Driskill, Linda Lowery  
 Connecticut College: Kenneth McBryde  
 Cornell College: Steve Miller  
 State University College at Cortland: Joel Maxey, Joan Sitterly, Judson Taylor  
 Curry College: Vinnie Eruzio

University of Dallas: Milam Joseph, Dick Strockbine, Fred Zuker  
 Daniel Webster College: Donna Ruseckas  
 Davis and Elkins College: Will Shaw  
 University of Dayton: Cindy Hartmann  
 Defiance College: Dick Kaiser, Steven Sondergaard  
 University of Delaware: Edgar Johnson  
 Delaware Valley College: Frank Wolfgang  
 Delta State University: Jim Jordan, David Potter, Mike Thompson, Kent Wyatt  
 Denison University: Dale Knobel, Larry Scheiderer  
 DePauw University: Page Cotton  
 University of Denver: Dianne Murphy, Nancy Sampson  
 Dickinson College: Leslie Poolman  
 University of District of Columbia: Alvin Darby  
 Dowling College: Robert Dranoff  
 Drew University: Vincent Masco, Connee Zotos

Drury University: Penny Clayton, Bruce Harger  
University of Dubuque: Dennis Rima

Earlham College: Porter Miller  
East Carolina University: Trenton Davis  
East Central University: Bill Cole, Timothy Green, Marc Petrowsky  
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania: Diane Husic, Joy Richman, Carey Snyder  
Eastern College: Heidi Birtwistle  
Eastern Connecticut State University: David Carter, Steven Kenton, Joyce Wong  
Eastern Illinois University: Rich McDuffie  
Eastern Mennonite University: Robert Roeschley  
Eastern Michigan University: David Diles, Samuel Kirkpatrick, Kenneth McKanders  
Eastern Nazarene College: Nancy Detwiler  
Eastern New Mexico University: Gary Musgrave, Rosie Stallman  
Eastern Oregon University: Peggy Anderson  
Eastern Washington University: Frank Nelson  
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania: Bruce Baumgartner  
Elizabeth City State University: Archie Griffin, Claudia Mackey, Edward McLean  
Elizabethtown College: Nancy Latimore, Theodore Long  
Elmhurst College: Christopher Ragsdale  
Elmira College: Patricia Thompson  
Elon College: Vicki Hightower  
Emerson College: Rick Bagby, Kristin Parnell  
Emory University: Chuck Gordon, Jennifer McDowell  
Emporia State University: Carmen Nelon, John Rich, Kay Schallenkamp, Kent Weiser  
Endicott College: Sharmon Hayward  
Eureka College: Joe Barth

Fairfield University: Eugene Doris, Alison Sexton  
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: William Klika  
Fairmont State College: David Cooper  
Fayetteville State University: William Carver, Clarence White  
Ferris State University: Tia Brandel-Wilhelm, Tom Kirinovic, Mark Kosciuszko  
Ferrum College: Michael Kinder  
University of Findlay: Linda Jackson, Steven Rackley, David Wallach  
Fisk University: George Neely  
Fitchburg State College: Sue Lauder  
University of Florida: Jeremy Foley, Heather Lawrence, Jamie McCloskey  
Florida A&M University: Ken Riley  
Florida Atlantic University: Tom Cargill, Anthony James Catanese, Dorothy Leland



Florida Institute of Technology: Cody Hein, William Jurgens  
 Florida International University: Bill Keppler, Rick Mello  
 Florida Southern College: Thomas Reuschling, Mike Roberts, Lois Webb  
 Florida State University: Robert Minnix  
 Fordham University: George Bisacca  
 Fort Hays State University: Edward Hammond, Glen McNeil, Tom Spicer  
 Fort Lewis College: Duane Smith, Joel Smith, Harlan Steinle  
 Fort Valley State University: Fred Harrison, Oscar Prater, Gwendolyn Reeves, Edward Wyche  
 Framingham State College: Tom Kelley  
 Francis Marion University: Murray Hartzler  
 Franklin College: Thomas Hodge  
 Franklin & Marshall College: Robert Bunnell, Patricia Epps  
 Franklin Pierce College: Bruce Kirsh  
 State University College at Fredonia: Dennis Hefner, Gregory Prechtel  
 Frostburg State University: Ralph Brewer, Roger Bruszewski, Lance Revenaugh  
  
 Gallaudet University: Richard Pelletier  
 Gannon University: Michael Corbett, Kathy MacMurdy  
 Gardner-Webb University: Chuck Burch  
 State University College at Geneseo: Marilyn Moore  
 George Fox University: Robin Baker, Craig Taylor  
 George Mason University: Thomas O'Connor  
 Georgetown University: Patricia Thomas  
 University of Georgia: Michael Adams, Gary Couvillon, Damon Evans, Hoke Wilder  
 Georgia College & State University: Stan Aldrige, Rosemary DePaolo, Jerry Fly  
 Georgia Southern University: Bruce Grube, Richard Rogers  
 Gettysburg College: Chuck Winters  
 Glenville State College: Gary Arbogast  
 Gordon College: Joe Hakes  
 Goucher College: Robert Lewand, Geoffrey Miller  
 Grambling State University: Albert Dennis, Autrey Howell, David Lewis  
 Grand Canyon University: Keith Baker, Claude Pensis, Gil Stafford  
 Grand Valley State University: Arend Lubbers, Tim Selgo, Lisa Sweany, Don VanderJagt  
 Greensboro College: Kim Strable  
 Greenville College: Doug Faulkner  
 Grinnell College: Dee Fairchild  
 Grove City College: Christopher Smith  
 Gustavus Adolphus College: Alan Molde

Hamilton College: Susan Viscomi  
 Hamline University: Katherine Romme  
 Hampden-Sydney College: Joseph Bush  
 Hampton University: Dennis Thomas  
 Hanover College: David Cassel, Lynn Hall  
 Harding University: David Burks, Greg Harnden, Wilt Martin  
 Hardin-Simmons University: John Neese  
 Hartwick College: Kenneth Kutler  
 University of Hawaii at Hilo: Kathleen McNally  
 University of Hawaii, Manoa: Stephen Martin  
 Hawaii Pacific University: Barbara Burke  
 Henderson State University: Sam Goodwin  
 Hendrix College: Dwayne Collins, Ann Die, Glen Tourville  
 Hilbert College: Richard L. Walsh  
 Hillsdale College: Mickey Craig, Michael Kovalchik  
 Hiram College: Wendell Jack  
 Hobart and William Smith Colleges: Susan Bassett  
 Hollins University: Lynda Calkins  
 College of the Holy Cross: Richard Regan Jr.  
 Hood College: Joseph Mahan  
 Hope College: Raymond Smith  
 Howard Payne University: Phil Fuller  
 Howard University: Morris Hawkins, Sondra Norell-Thomas  
 Humboldt State University: Gail Fults, Mike Swan  
 Hunter College: Terry Wansart  
  
 Idaho State University: Howard Gauthier  
 University of Illinois, Champaign: Lawrence Mann  
 Illinois College: Bill Merris  
 Illinois Wesleyan University: Jack Fields  
 University of the Incarnate Word: Howard Patterson  
 Indiana University, Bloomington: Clarence Doninger, William Perkins  
 Indiana State University: Andrea Myers  
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Frank Condino, Steven Ender, Pete Goldsmith, Frances Nee, Lawrence Pettit  
 Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne: Elliott Blumenthal, Walter Bowman, David Skelton  
 University of Indianapolis: Kenneth Borden, David Huffman, Suzanne Willey  
 Iona College: Kara Brennan  
 University of Iowa: Robert Bowlsby, W.H. Knight, Fred Mims, Mark E. Schantz, Yvonne Slatton  
 Iowa State University: Elaine Hieber  
 Ithaca College: Kristen Ford, Michael Lindberg, Brian McAree, Henry Neubert  
  
 Jackson State University: Roy Culberson

Jacksonville State University: Hope Davis  
 Jacksonville University: Donna Kirk, Michelle Neil  
 James Madison University: Ashley Kite  
 John Carroll University: Tony DeCarlo, Jonathan Ivec, Richard  
     Salmi, Gretchen Weitbrecht  
 John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Susan Larkin  
 Johns Hopkins University: Thomas Calder, Faith Shearer  
 Johnson and Wales University: Jamie Murray, John Parente  
 Johnson C. Smith University: Cynthia Anderson, Helen Caldwell,  
     Eugene Hermitte, Catherine Wright  
 Juniata College: Lawrence Bock

Kalamazoo College: Robert Kent  
 University of Kansas: Robert Frederick, Janelle Martin  
 Kansas State University: Michael Holen, Max Urick  
 Kean University: Ronald Applbaum, Kim Culligan, Glen Hedden  
 Keene State College: John Ratliff  
 Kennesaw State University: Dave Waples  
 Kent State University: Laing Kennedy, George Stevens  
 University of Kentucky: Kathleen DeBoer, John Piccoro, Charles T.  
     Wethington  
 Kentucky State University: Harold Benson, Tiffany Ford, Derrick  
     Ramsey, George Reid  
 Kentucky Wesleyan College: James Welch  
 Kenyon College: Jennifer Bruening  
 King's College (Pennsylvania): Cheryl Ish  
 Knox College: Dan Calandro  
 Kutztown University of Pennsylvania: Betty Wesner, Clark Yeager

La Roche College: Linda Jordan, William Kerr, Jim Tinkey  
 University of La Verne: Jim Paschal, Rick Simon  
 Lafayette College: Eve Atkinson  
 Lake Erie College: Mary Ann Naso, James Schweickert  
 Lake Forest College: Chad Eisele  
 Lake Superior State University: Thomas Boger, William Crawford  
 Lakeland College: Jane Bouche  
 Lander University: Daniel Ball, Jeff May  
 Lane College: J.L. Perry  
 Lasell College: Kristy Walter  
 Lawrence University: Dave Brown  
 Le Moyne College: Dick Rockwell, Shawn Ward  
 Lebanon Valley College: Kathleen Tierney  
 Lees-McRae College: Ried Estus, Earl Robinson, Mary White  
 Lehman College: Roxann Moraza  
 Le Moyne-Owen College: E.D. Wilkens  
 Lenoir-Rhyne College: Rueus Moretz, Joe Smith  
 Lewis and Clark College: Nora Beck, Greg Fredricks, Steve Wallo  
 Lewis University: Raphael Mascari, Paul Zakowski

Limestone College: Michael Scerbo  
 Lincoln Memorial University: Jerry Bishop  
 Lincoln University (Missouri): Theresa Ferguson, Robert Robinson  
 Lincoln University (Pennsylvania): Ivory Nelson  
 Livingstone College: Clifton Huff, Bernell Jones  
 Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania: Sharon Taylor  
 Longwood College: Patricia Cormier, Sally Gilfillan, Donald Lemish,  
     Ellen Moss  
 Loras College: Jane Specht  
 Louisiana State University: David Bahnsen, Pat Culbertson, Mark  
     Emmert  
 University of Louisville: Julie Hermann, Thomas Jurich  
 Luther College: Joe Thompson  
 Lynchburg College: Jack Toms  
 Lynn University: Gregory Malfitano, Ralph Norcio, Richard Young  
  
 Macalester College: John Leaney, Jack Rossman, Vanessa Seljeskog  
 University of Maine, Farmington: Julie Davis  
 University of Maine, Orono: Peter Hoff, George Jacobson  
 Manchester College: Tom Jarman, Martha Judge, David Kreps  
 Manhattan College: Robert Byrnes, Sandra Sapone  
 Manhattanville College: Lawson Bowling, Sean Frazier  
 Mansfield University of Pennsylvania: Kristen Falk, Roger Maisner  
 Maranatha Baptist Bible College: Terry Price  
 Marian College (Wisconsin): Doug Hammonds  
 Marietta College: Jeanne Arbuckle, Robert Chase, Deborah Lazorik  
 Marist College: Chandra Bierwirth, Tim Murray  
 State University of New York Maritime College: James Migli  
 Marquette University: Gregory Naples, Kathryn Statz  
 Mars Hill College: David Riggins  
 Marshall University: Lance West  
 University of Mary Hardin-Baylor: Darla Kirby, Ben Shipp  
 Mary Washington College: Edward Hegmann  
 University of Maryland, College Park: Charles Welford, Deborah Yow  
 University of Maryland, Eastern Shore: Henry Brooks, Vivian Fuller,  
     Taunya Tinsley, Clifford Wiley  
 Maryville University of Saint Louis: David Pierce  
 Marywood University: Mary Jo Gunning  
 University of Massachusetts, Boston: Pam Samuelson, Charlie Titus  
 University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth: James Griffith, Jean  
     MacCormack, Robert Mullen, Marylou Thimas  
 University of Massachusetts at Lowell: Jon Hellstedt, Dana Skinner  
 Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts: Scott Nichols  
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology: John Benedick, Jean Heiney  
 Medgar Evers College: Roy Anderson  
 Mercer University: Mary Jo Vaughan  
 Mercy College: Neil Judge  
 Mercyhurst College: Pete Russo

Merrimack College: Bruce Baker, Robert DeGregorio  
 Mesa State College: Doug Schakel  
 Messiah College: Jerry Chaplin, Amy Weaver  
 Methodist College: Bob McEvoy  
 Metropolitan State College of Denver: Joe Arcese, Brian Crookham  
 University of Miami (Florida): Craig Angelos  
 University of Michigan: Percy Bates, William Martin, Megan McAllister, Ann Vollano  
 Michigan State University: Judith Van Horn  
 Michigan Technological University: Pat Joyce, Michele Miller, Suzanne Sanregret, Richard Yeo  
 Middle Tennessee State University: Race Bergman  
 Middlebury College: Carson Foote, Russell Reilly  
 Midwestern State University: Bob McBee, Henry Moon, Norman Williams, Rickey Williams  
 Millersville University of Pennsylvania: Daniel Audette, Thomas Greco, Robert Thomas, Marjorie Trout  
 Millikin University: Merle Chapman, Lori Kerans  
 Mills College: Themy Adachi  
 Millsaps College: Ron Jurney  
 Milwaukee School of Engineering: Dan Harris  
 University of Minnesota, Duluth: Jonathan Conant, Robert Corran, Gregory Fox, Linda Larson  
 University of Minnesota, Morris: Mark Fohl  
 University of Minnesota, Twin Cities: Linda Brady, Frank Kara, Chris Voelz, Richard Weinberg  
 Minnesota State University-Mankato: Don Amiot, Ken Anglin, Jeff Pribyl, Sue Reinders, Richard Rush  
 Minnesota State University Moorhead: Roland Barden, George Sanderson, Marlene Sanderson, Katy Wilson  
 College Misericordia: Michael Mould  
 University of Mississippi: John Shafer, Robert Weems  
 Mississippi College: Susan Musselwhite, Tom Williams  
 Mississippi University for Women: Rita Hinton, Jo Spearman  
 Mississippi Valley State University: Charles Prophet  
 University of Missouri, Columbia: Sarah Reesman, Carl Settergren  
 University of Missouri, Kansas City: Robert Thomas  
 University of Missouri, Rolla: Mark Mullin, Sarah Preston, Gary Thomas  
 University of Missouri, St. Louis: Patricia Dolan, Thomas Schnell  
 Missouri Southern State College: Sallie Beard, John Tiede  
 Missouri Western State College: Brenda Blessing, Pete Chapman, Mark Linder, Patsy Smith  
 Molloy College: Robert Houlihan  
 Monmouth University: Marilyn McNeil  
 University of Montana: Wayne Hogan  
 Montana State University-Billings: Gary Gray, Kathy Holt  
 Montana State University-Bozeman: Charles Lindemenn, Calli

## Sanders

University of Montevallo: Michael Cancilla, Robert Chesney  
Montclair State University: Holly Gera, Anita Kubicka  
Moravian College: Paul Moyer  
Morehead State University: Ronald Edglin, David Mincey  
Morehouse College: Andre Pattillo, Willie Shaw, Dianne Watkins  
Morgan State University: Leon Donaldson, David Thomas  
Morningside College: Beth Sibenaller  
Morris Brown College: Beverly Arnaud, Gene Bright, Johnnie Myers  
Mount Holyoke College: Laurie Priest  
Mount Olive College: Mac Cassell  
College of Mount St. Joseph: Michele Benoit, Karl Power, Steven Radcliffe, Georgana Taggart  
Mount Saint Mary College (New York): Dan Twomey, John Wright  
Mount St. Mary's College: Harold Menninger  
Mount Union College: Truman Turnquist  
Muhlenberg College: Rudolph Ehrenberg, Stephen Erber  
Murray State University: E.W. Dennison, Christian Pope

Nazareth College: Peter Bothner, Annette Shapiro  
University of Nebraska at Kearney: Bruce Elder, Gladys Johnston, Joan Patrick, Laure Smith, Michael Sumpter  
University of Nebraska, Lincoln: Josephine Potuto  
University of Nebraska, Omaha: James Buck, Robert Danenhauer, Cherri Mankenberg, Bill Wakefield, B.J. White  
Nebraska Wesleyan University: Jeanie Watson, Ira Zeff  
Neumann College: Joseph Gillespie, Joseph Giunta  
University of Nevada: Joseph Crowley, Chris Exline, Keith Lee  
University of New England: Dennis Leighton, Karol L'Heureux  
New England College: Lori Runksmeier  
University of New Hampshire: David O'Connor  
New Hampshire College: Joseph Polak  
University of New Haven: Anthony Adams, Deborah Chin, Lawrence Denardis, Robin Salters  
The College of New Jersey: Kevin McHugh  
New Jersey City University: Larry Schiner  
New Jersey Institute of Technology: Leonard Kaplan  
University of New Mexico: Rudy Davalos, Bill McGillis  
New Mexico Highlands University: Roy Lujan, Selimo Rael  
State University College at New Paltz: Colleen Bruley, Stuart Robinson  
College of New Rochelle: Harold Crocker  
New York Institute of Technology: Clyde Doughty  
  
New York University: Christopher Bledsoe  
Newberry College: Oliver Johnson  
Niagara University: Michael Hermann

Nichols College: Charlyn Robert, Jo Williams  
 University of North Alabama: Robert Potts, Patricia Roden, Dan Summy  
 University of North Carolina, Asheville: Gary Nallan  
 University of North Carolina, Charlotte: David Goldfield  
 University of North Carolina, Greensboro: David Knight  
 University of North Carolina at Pembroke: Susan Edkins, Dan Kenney, Allen Meadors  
 North Carolina Central University: Les Brinson, J. Lin Dawson, Ingrid Wicker  
 North Carolina State University: Arthur Cooper, Eileen Goldgeiger, Donn Ward  
 North Central College: Walter Johnson  
 University of North Dakota: Phil Harmeson, Charles Kupchella, Kathleen McCann, Roger Thomas  
 North Dakota State University: Thomas Riley  
 University of North Florida: Henry Camp, Richard Gropper, Kathy Klein, Mark Workman  
 North Park University: Susan Zimmer  
 University of North Texas: Allen Ward  
 Northeastern State University: Matt Cochran, Eddie Griffin, Scott Pettus, Louis White, Larry Williams  
 Northeastern University: Kevin Porter  
 Northern Arizona University: Kelly Woodward  
 University of Northern Colorado: Jim Fallis, Bob Heiny, Julie Warrington  
 Northern Illinois University: Cary Sue Groth  
 Northern Kentucky University: Scott Eaton, Thomas Kearns, Jane Meier  
 Northern Michigan University: Dan Spielmann, Jim Suksi, Brian Verigin  
 Northern State University: William Haigh, Bob Olson  
 Northwest Missouri State University: Wanda Exceen, Russ Northup, Sherri Reeves  
 Northwestern State University: Randall J. Webb  
 Northwood University: David Marsh, Elizabeth Minbiole  
 Norwich University: Anthony Mariano  
 College of Notre Dame (Maryland): Margie Tversky  
 University of Notre Dame: Fernand Dutille  
  
 Oberlin College: Scott McMillin, Michael Muska  
 Occidental College: Dixon Farmer  
 Oglethorpe University: Jack Berkshire, Larry Large  
 Ohio Northern University: Thomas Simmons, Ellen Wilson, Kate Witte  
 Ohio State University: Susan Hartman, William Kirwan, Miechelle Willis  
 Ohio University: Thomas Boeh, Peggy Pruitt, Patrick Washburn

Ohio Wesleyan University: Thomas Courtice  
University of Oklahoma: Dan Gibbens  
Oklahoma State University: Gerald Lage  
Old Dominion University: Janis Sanchez-Hucles  
State University College at Old Westbury: John Lonardo  
Olivet College: Nancy Van Hoozier, Charles Wilson  
State University College at Oneonta: Carol Blazina  
University of Oregon: Dave Frohnmayer, Gary Gray  
State University College at Oswego: Dani Drews, Sandra Moore  
Otterbein College: Deborah Quackenbush  
Ouachita Baptist University: David Sharp, Andy Westmoreland  
University of the Ozarks: Jim Abbuhl, Buddy Smith

Pace University: Joseph O'Donnell, Risa Ott  
University of the Pacific (California): Allison Freedman  
Pacific Lutheran University: Paul Hoseth  
Pacific University (Oregon): Faith Gabelnick, Judy Sherman  
Paine College: Ronnie Spry, Roscoe Williams  
University of Pennsylvania: Steven Bilsky  
Pennsylvania State University: John Bove, Scott Kretchmar, Ellen Perry  
Pennsylvania State University Erie, the Behrend College: John Lilley, Brian Streeter, Rod Troester  
Philadelphia University: Thomas Shirley  
Pittsburg State University: Charles Broyles, Tom Bryant, Elwyn Davis, Natalie Salmans  
University of Pittsburgh: Susan Albrecht, Donna Sanft  
University of Pittsburgh, Bradford: Richard Frederick, Lorraine Mazza, Richard McDowell  
University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown: Anthony Capon  
State University of New York at Plattsburgh: Michael Miranda, Peter Luguri  
Plymouth State College: John Clark, Peter Cofran  
Polytechnic University (New York): Laddy Baldwin, Maureen Braziel, Robert Zelg  
Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Lisa Beckett  
State University College at Potsdam: Michael Lewis, Ellen McEwen, James Zalacca  
Presbyterian College: Valerie Sheley  
University of Puget Sound: Nancy Bristow, Richard Ulrich

Queens College (New York): Richard Wettan  
Quincy University: Patrick Atwell, John Coats  
Quinnipiac University: Jack McDonald

Ramapo College: Catherine Collins, Dawn DeRosa, Eugene Marshall, Michael Ricciardi  
Randolph-Macon College: Jeff Burns, Gregg Waters



Randolph-Macon Woman's College: Valerie Cushman  
 University of Redlands: James Appleton, Jeff Martinez, Christopher Walker  
 Regis College (Massachusetts): Judy Burling, Johanna Dicarolo  
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert Ducatte, Kerry Quinn  
 University of Rhode Island: Paul Kassabian  
 Rhode Island College: Gary Penfield, Donald Tencher  
 Rhodes College: Mike Clary, Sarah Hatgas  
 Rice University: James Castaneda  
 Richard Stockton College of New Jersey: George James  
 Rider University: Curtis Blake, Nancy Roberts  
 Rivier College: Joanne Merrill  
 Roanoke College: Scott Allison  
 University of Rochester: Cindy Cohen, George Vanderzwaag  
 Rochester Institute of Technology: Janet Jones  
 Rockford College: Kristyn King  
 Rockhurst University: Frank Diskin  
 Roger Williams University: William Baird, Anthony Pesare  
 Rollins College: Joan Davison, Phillip Roach  
 Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology: Greg Ruark  
 Rosemont College: Pamela Wojnar  
 Rowan University: Joy Reighn, Ed Streb  
 Russell Sage College: Candice Poiss  
 Rust College: David Beckley  
 Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Newark: John Adams, Kim Allen  
 Saginaw Valley State University: George Eastland, Camille Rutherford, Griz Zimmerman  
 Saint Anselm College: Edward Cannon  
 St. Augustine's College: Richard Moore, George Williams  
 College of St. Benedict: Carol Howe Veenstra, Luann Reif  
 College of St. Catherine: Sheila Brown  
 St. Cloud State University: Sue Becker, Art Grachek, Shawna Hutchins, Morris Kurtz, Roy Saigo  
 St. Edward's University: John Knorr, Frank Smith  
 St. John Fisher College: Jill McCabe, Robert Ward  
 St. John's University (Minnesota): Kenneth Jones  
 St. Joseph College (Connecticut): William Cardarelli  
 Saint Joseph's College (Indiana): Camie Bechtold, Teresa Massoela, Albert Shannon  
 St. Joseph's College (New York): Don Lizak  
 St. Joseph's University: Don DiJulia  
 St. Lawrence University: Margie Strait, Jim Wallace  
 Saint Leo University: Francis Reidy  
 Saint Louis University: Doug Woolard  
 St. Martin's College: Robert Grisham  
 St. Mary's College (California): Carl Clapp, Mark Orr, Stephanie Shrieve, Don Stabile

Saint Mary's College (Indiana): Don S. Balka, Lynn Kachmarik  
 St. Mary's College of Maryland: Scott Devine  
 St. Mary's University (Texas): Charles Cotrell, Steve Johnson  
 St. Mary's University of Minnesota: Linda Anderson  
 St. Michael's College: Geraldine Knortz  
 St. Olaf College: Cindy Book  
 St. Paul's College: Sunday Adesuyi, Leroy Bacote  
 St. Peter's College: William Stein, Mary Wessely  
 College of Saint Rose: Catherine Haker  
 University of St. Thomas (Minnesota): JoAnn Andregg  
 Salem State College: John Galoris, Nash Nunn  
 Salem International University: Gary McAllister, Lou Talerico  
 Salisbury State University: Michael Vienna  
 Salve Regina University: Del Malloy, John Rok  
 Samford University: Robert Roller  
 University of San Diego: Mitch Malachowski  
 San Diego State University: Roger Caves  
 San Francisco State University: Patricia Bartscher, Kathleen  
 Heitzman, Michael Simpson  
 Santa Clara University: Cheryl Levick  
 Savannah College of Art and Design: Jud Damon, Jim Mathews  
 Savannah State University: Carlton Brown, Charles Elmore, George  
 N. Williams  
 University of Scranton: Toby Lovecchio  
 Seattle Pacific University: Thomas Box, Robert Huber, William  
 Woodward  
 Shaw University: Al Carter, Dianthia Ford-Kee, Ernest Pickens  
 Shepherd College: Barbara Beard  
 Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania: George Harpster, Roberta  
 Page, James G. Pribula  
 Siena College: John D'Argenio  
 Simpson College: Kevin La Gree, Bruce Sloan  
 Skidmore College: Tim Brown  
 Slippery Rock University: Robertha Abney, Paul Lueken, Robert J.  
 Watson  
 Smith College: Lynn Oberbillig  
 Sonoma State University: William Crowley, Catherine Dougherty,  
 Bill Fusco  
 University of the South: Nancy Ladd, Mark Webb  
 South Carolina State University: Timothy J. Autry, Leroy Davis Sr.  
 University of South Carolina at Aiken: Thomas Hallman, Randy  
 Warrick  
 University of South Carolina, Columbia: Michael McGee, John  
 Palms, Susie Vanhuss  
 University of South Carolina-Spartanburg: Mike Hall, John C.  
 Stockwell  
 University of South Dakota: Kelly Higgins, John Powell, Kim Zarling  
 South Dakota State University: Mylo Hellickson, Nancy Neiber, Fred  
 Oien

University of South Florida: Steve Horton  
 Southampton College of Long Island University: Mary Topping  
 Southeast Missouri State University: Don Kaverman  
 Southeastern Oklahoma State University: Glen Johnson, Donald A. Parham, Jerry Polson  
 Southern Arkansas University: Lisa Colvin, Steve Dingman, Steven Gamble  
 Southern Connecticut State University: Antonio Aceto, Michael Adanti, Lawrence Fitzgerald, Patricia Nicol, Darryl Rogers  
 Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Cynthia Jones, John Meisel, David Werner  
 University of Southern Indiana: Jackson Marr, Steve Newton  
 University of Southern Maine: Albert Bean  
 Southern Methodist University: Charles Howard  
 Southern University, Baton Rouge: Dana Carpenter, Floyd Kerr  
 Southern Utah University: Kathryn Berg  
 Southern Vermont College: Scott Kilgallon  
 Southwest Baptist University: Kevin Schriver, Pat Taylor, Joanne Vaughn  
 Southwest Missouri State University: Darlene Bailey  
 Southwest State University: Rolly Muller, Lloyd Raymond  
 Southwestern Oklahoma State University: Joe Anna Hibler, Kelli Litsch  
 Southwestern University (Texas): Sherri Babcock, John Delaney, Glada Munt, Jake Schrum  
 Springfield College: Richard Flynn, Betty Mann, Craig Poisson, Cathie Schweitzer  
 Stanford University: Debra Gore-Mann, Ted Leland  
 College of Staten Island: Harold Merritt, Marlene Springer  
 Stephen F. Austin State University: Steve McCarty, Baker Pattillo  
 Stephens College: Marcia Kierscht  
 Stetson University: Jeffrey Altier, Richard Skeel  
 Stevens Institute of Technology: Russell Rogers  
 Stillman College: Richard Cosby, Myrtes Dunn Green, Sharon Whittaker  
 Stonehill College: Paula Sullivan  
 Suffolk University: James Nelson  
 Sul Ross State University: Kay Whitley  
 Susquehanna University: Connie Harnum, Don Harnum  
 Swarthmore College: Robert Williams  
 Sweet Briar College: Milly MacDonell  
 Syracuse University: Janet Kittell  
  
 University of Tampa: Larry Marfise  
 Tarleton State University: Susan Burton, Steve Crews, Lamar Johanson, Dennis McCabe, Lonnie McMillan

Temple University: Kristen Foley  
 University of Tennessee, Knoxville: Joan Cronan, Doug Dickey,  
 James Wade Gilley, Malcolm McInnis  
 University of Tennessee at Martin: Phil Dane  
 Tennessee State University: Derell Stinson  
 University of Texas at Austin: DeLoss Dodds, Edwin Dorn, Patricia  
 Ohlendorf, Christine Plonsky, Leroy Sutherland  
 University of Texas at El Paso: Kevin Hatcher  
 University of Texas, Pan American: Bill Weidner  
 University of Texas at San Antonio: Lynn Hickey  
 Texas A&M University, College Station: Thomas Adair  
 Texas A&M University-Commerce: Randy McBroom, Keith  
 McFarland, Paul Peak, Tom Tallach  
 Texas A&M University-Kingsville: Livia Diaz, Robert Kirby, Jill  
 Wilson  
 Texas Christian University: Rhonda Hatcher  
 Texas Lutheran College: Missy McCaughey, Bill Miller  
 Texas Tech University: Shane Lyons, Robert Sweazy  
 Texas Wesleyan University: Harold Jeffcoat  
 Texas Woman's University: Richard Nicholas, Beth Palmer, Judy  
 Southard  
 Thiel College: Roseanne Gill-Jacobson, Lance Masters  
 Trinity College (Connecticut): Richard Hazelton, Robin Sheppard  
 Trinity College (District of Columbia): Tina Book, Kathryn Ingraham  
 Trinity University (Texas): Robert King  
 Troy State University: Lamar Daniel, Johnny Williams  
 Truman State University: David McKamie, Becky Pike, Jerry  
 Wollmering  
 Tufts University: John DiBaggio, William Gehling  
 University of Tulsa: Bob Lawless  
 Tusculum College: Deborah Davis, Ed Hoffmeyer  
 Tuskegee University: Rick Comegy, Cecil Davis  
  
 Union College: Val Belmonte  
 U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Ray Cieplik, Howard Dunn  
 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Susan Petersen-Lubow  
 U.S. Military Academy: Julie Sullivan  
 U.S. Naval Academy: Thomas Bates  
 Upper Iowa University: Karla Gavin, Rick Klaan  
 Ursinus College: Carrie Reilly, Brian Thomas  
 Utah State University: Kermit Hall, Fred Hunsaker, Michael Parent,  
 Rance Pugmire, Kenneth White  
 Utica College: Todd Hutton, James Spartano  
  
 Valdosta State University: Hugh Bailey, Herbert Reinhard, Robert  
 Tucker  
 Vanderbilt University: Brad Bates, Jim Booz, Michelle Kennedy,  
 Todd Turner

Vassar College: Andy Jennings, Louise McCleary, Ellen Shilkret  
 University of Vermont: Richard Farnham  
 Villa Julie College: Patricia Wilkerson, Carol Zimmerman  
 Villanova University: John Robinson  
 University of Virginia: John Casteen  
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University: Jon Jaudon  
 Virginia State University: Roosevelt Cunningham, Claud Flythe,  
 Michael Shackelford  
 Virginia Union University: James Battle, Bernard Franklin  
 Virginia Wesleyan College: Sonny Travis  
  
 Wabash College: David Phillips  
 Wagner College: Walter Hameline  
 Wake Forest University: Ronald Wellman  
 Wartburg College: Gillian Gremmels, Marcus Newsom  
 Washburn University of Topeka: Larry Blumberg, Janet Degginger,  
 Jerry Farley, Loren Ferre'  
 University of Washington: Robert Aronson, Barbara Hedges, Dana  
 Richardson  
 Washington and Jefferson College: John Gregor, Richard Soudan  
 Washington and Lee University: Cinda Rankin, Michael Walsh  
 Washington College (Maryland): Penny Fall, Bryan Matthews  
 Washington University (Missouri): Lynn Imergott, John Schael,  
 Thornton Shelton  
 Wayne State College (Nebraska): Todd Barry, Curt Frye  
 Wayne State University (Michigan): Rob Fournier, Mel Small, Allison  
 Tookes  
 Waynesburg College: Dan Baranik  
 Webster University: Thomas Hart, Patrick Rishe  
 Wellesley College: Dana Harmon, Louise O'Neal, Suzanne Walmsley  
 Wells College: Lyn Labar  
 Wentworth Institute of Technology: Lee Conrad  
 Wesley College: Scott Burnam  
 Wesleyan College (Georgia): Peter Smith  
 Wesleyan University (Connecticut): John Biddiscombe  
 University of West Alabama: Dee Outlaw, Ed Roach, Micky Smith  
 West Chester University of Pennsylvania: Barbara Cleghorn,  
 Edward Matejkovic, Paul Oliaro  
 University of West Florida: Richard Berg, Nicole Keshock, Doug  
 Palmer  
 State University of West Georgia: Costa Douvanis  
 West Liberty State College: David Brooks, James Watson  
 West Texas A&M University: Ed Harris, Russell Long  
 West Virginia University Institute of Technology: Robert Simile  
 West Virginia State College: S. Bryce Casto  
 West Virginia Wesleyan College: George Klebez  
 Western Connecticut State University: Edward Farrington, James  
 Roach

Western Maryland College: Carol Fritz, James Smith  
 Western Michigan University: Kathy Beauregard  
 Western New England College: Richard DiRuza, Michael Theulen  
 Western New Mexico University: Christine Casey, Scott Woodard  
 Western Oregon University: Jon Carey  
 Western State College of Colorado: Harry Peterson, Greg Waggoner  
 Western Washington University: Michael DiMarco, Lynda Goodrich,  
     Karen Morse, Ronald Riggins  
 Westfield State College: Edwin Abar, Ken Magarian  
 Westminster College (Missouri): Bob Hansen, Terry Logue  
 Westminster College (Pennsylvania): James Dafler  
 Wheaton College (Illinois): Wayne Ladd  
 Wheaton College (Massachusetts): John Yowell  
 Wheeling Jesuit University: George Lundy, John Mansuy  
 Whitman College: Julia Dunn, Travis Freezell, Craig Gunsul  
 Whittier College: Dave Jacobs, Joe Price  
 Whitworth College: Scott McGulkin  
 Widener University: Steven Adams  
 Wilkes University: Addy Malatesta  
 Willamette University: Mark Majeski  
 William Paterson University of New Jersey: Arthur Eason, Sabrina  
     Grant  
 Williams College: Lisa Melendy, Harry Sheey  
 Wilmington College (Ohio): Daniel DiBiasio, Terry Rupert  
 Wilson College: Lori Frey, Shelly Novak  
 Wingate University: Doreen McAlfee, Jerry McGee  
 Winona State University: Kim Blum, Larry Holstad  
 Winston-Salem State University: Paul Cloud, Anne Little  
 Winthrop University: Thomas Hickman  
 Wisconsin Lutheran College: Cheryl Pasbrig  
 University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire: Marilyn Skrivseth  
 University of Wisconsin, La Crosse: Joseph Baker, Jearold Holland  
 University of Wisconsin, Madison: Pat Richter  
 University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh: Allen Ackerman, Eugene Johnson,  
     C. Burk Tower  
 University of Wisconsin, Parkside: John P. Keating, Lenny Klaver,  
     William Murin, David Williams  
 University of Wisconsin, Platteville: David Markee, Mark  
     Molesworth  
 University of Wisconsin, River Falls: Connie Foster, Dean Henderson  
 University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point: Frank O'Brien  
 University of Wisconsin, Stout: Tom Franklin, Donna Stewart, Steve  
     Terry, John Wesolek  
 University of Wisconsin, Superior: James Lund  
 University of Wisconsin, Whitewater: Shawn Eichorst  
 Wittenberg University: Jeff Ankrom  
 College of Wooster: Stanton Hales, Robert Malekoff, Brenda Meese,  
     John Ramsay

Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Raymond Gilbert  
Worcester State College: Sue Chapman

Xavier University: Mike Bobinski

Yale University: Colleen Lim  
York College (New York): Ronald St. John  
Youngstown State University: Kathylynn Feld, Pauline Saternow

## **Conference Members**

America East Conference: Chris Monasch, Julie Ruppert  
Atlantic Coast Conference: Bernadette McGlade, Thomas Mickle,  
John Swofford, David Thompson  
Atlantic 10 Conference: Linda Bruno, Jacqueline Campbell

Big East Conference: Michael Tranghese, Stan Wilcox  
Big Sky Conference: Douglas Fullerton  
Big South Conference: Kyle Kallander  
Big Ten Conference: James Delany, Jennifer Hepple, Carol Iwaoka  
Big 12 Conference: Britton Banowsky, Lori Ebihara, Pentice Gautt  
Big West Conference: Dennis Farrell

California Collegiate Athletic Association: Monica Heuer, Robert  
Hiegert, Joe Lang  
Capital Athletic Conference: Richard Cook  
Carolinas-Virginia Athletic Conference: Alan Patterson  
Centennial Conference: Jennifer Brehm, Steven Ulrich  
Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference: Mark Corino, Richard  
McGlynn  
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Marcus Grant, Leon  
Kerry, Jeffrey McLeod, Monique Morgan  
City University of New York Athletic Conference: Zak Ivkovic  
College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin: Merle Chapman  
Collegiate Water Polo Association: Daniel Sharadin  
Colonial Athletic Association: Thomas Yeager  
Commonwealth Coast Conference: Stephen Washkevich  
Conference USA: Noreen Morris, Mike Slive

Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Rita Wiggs

Eastern College Athletic Conference: Vanessa Abell, Steve Bamford,  
Phil Buttafuoco, Patrick Summers  
Empire Eight: Michael Gentile

Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Thomas Brown  
Great Lakes Valley Conference: Jim Naumovich  
Great Northeast Athletic Conference: Donna Ruseckas

Gulf South Conference: Nathan N. Salant  
Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference: Tom Bohlson

Ivy Group: Carolyn Campbell-McGovern, Jeffrey Orleans

Little East Conference: William Moore  
Lone Star Conference: Fred H. Jacoby

Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference: Scott Nichols  
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference: Richard Ensor, Roger Jeffries,  
John Leonard, Ken Taylor, Beth Washburn

Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Sheila Wallace-  
Kovalchick

Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association: Ralph McFillen  
Mid-American Conference: Rick Chryst, Stephanie McDonald, Dell  
Robinson

Mid-Continent Conference: Jon Steinbrecher  
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Charles Harris, James Wyatt  
Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: Kenneth  
Andrews

Midwest Conference: Chris Graham, Ralph Shively  
Midwestern Collegiate Conference: Alfreeda Goff, Jon LeCrone  
Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Carlyle Carter  
Missouri Valley Conference: Patty Viverito  
Mountain West Conference: Carolayne Henry, Craig Thompson

New England Small College Athletic Conference: Peter Gooding,  
Andrea Savage

New Jersey Athletic Conference: Sabrina Grant, Donna Ledwin  
New York Collegiate Athletic Conference: Thomas Gallagher  
North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Michael Marcil,  
Melanie Nelson

North Coast Athletic Conference: Dennis Collins  
Northeast-10 Conference: Dave Brunk  
Northern Illinois-Iowa Conference: John Stachniak  
Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference: Mike Lockrem  
Northwest Conference: Arleigh Dodson

Ohio Athletic Conference: Tim Gleason  
Ohio Valley Conference, Dan Beebe  
Old Dominion Athletic Conference: Brad Bankston

Pacific-10 Conference: Thomas Hansen, Christine Hoyles, Michael  
Matthews

Pacific West Conference: Elwood Hahn  
Patriot League: Carolyn Schlie-Femovich  
Peach Belt Conference: Marvin Vanover  
Pennsylvania Athletic Conference: Thomas Bonerbo



Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference: Steve Murray  
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference: Kurt Patberg

St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Rich Meckfessel  
South Atlantic Conference: Doug Echols, Dennis Switzer  
Southeastern Conference: Sandy Atkins, Beth DeBauche, Roy  
Kramer, Mark Womack  
Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Christopher  
Walker  
Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference: Steve Argo  
Southern Conference: Alfred White  
Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Robert Vowels  
Southland Conference: Beth Chapman, Greg Sankey  
Southwestern Athletic Conference: Rudy Washington  
State University of New York Athletic Conference: Patrick Damore  
Sunshine State Conference: Don Landry

Trans America Athletic Conference: Bill Bibb, Steve Sturek

University Athletic Association: Glenn Nicholls, Dick Rasmussen  
Upstate Collegiate Athletic Association: Geoff Brown, Phil  
Buttafuoco

West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Barry Blizzard  
Western Athletic Conference: Karl Benson, Patrick Hairston  
Western Collegiate Hockey Association: Bruce McLeod  
Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Gary Karner

## **Provisional Members**

Bay Path College: Marcia Conrad, Steven Smith  
Becker College: Gene Alley  
Benedict College: Margaret English-Jones, Loretta Herrin,  
Gwendolyn Rouse, David Swinton, Willie Washington  
Birmingham-Southern College: Leslie Claybrook, Joe Dean  
Bloomfield College: Ilona Anderson, Robert Estler, Kathy Perri,  
Sheila Wooten

Caldwell College: Mark Corino, Dean Johnson, Sister Michael  
Rodgers, Patrick Sime, Sister Patrice Werner  
Concordia University, St. Paul: Bob Holst, Dan O'Brien, Michael  
Walcheski  
Converse College: Nancy Gray, Margaret Moore, Suzanne Smith

D'Youville College: Brian Miller, Denise Roche  
Dallas Baptist University: Gary Cook, Steve Mullen, Wayne Poage  
DeSales University: Gracia Perilli  
Dominican College (New York): Joseph Clinton, Mary O'Brien

Dominican University (Illinois): Maureen Harty, Steve Kuhn

East Texas Baptist University: Kent Reeves, Bob Riley

State University of New York at Farmingdale: Tom Azzara, Michael Harrington, George LaRosa, Michael Vinciguerra

Felician College: Alfredo Castro, Sister Tarcilia Juchniewicz, Heather Mac Culloch, Theresa Mary Martin, Robert Symons

Georgian Court College: Mary Cranwel, Debra Emery, Claire Gallagher

Goldey-Beacom College: Mohammad Ilyas, Chris Morgan, Bernadette Wimberley

Green Mountain College: Carol Denniston, Christopher Gilmore, Carol Hartshorn, Stanley Wilbur

Holy Family College: Megan Dougherty, Patrice Feher, Sandra Michael, Francesca Onley

Huntingdon College: Randy Arnold, Wanda Bigham, Frank Montecalvo, Duane Trogdon

Husson College: William Beardsley, Pam Hennessey

La Grange College: Stuart Gulley, Phil Williamson

Lesley College: Marlene Godfrey, Stanley Vieira

LeTourneau University: Alvin Austin, Dirk Nelson

Lipscomb University: Steve Potts

Louisiana College: Sheila Johnson, Rory Lee

Medaille College: Laura Edholm, Richard Herdlein

University of Minnesota, Crookston: Lon Boike, Vern Markey, Donald Sargeant

Mount Ida College: Carol Matteson, Jacqueline Palmer

New York City Technical College: Ray Amalbert

Newbury College: Roy Nirschel, Mike Tully

North Greenville College: Suzanne Dodd, Jimmy Epting, Jan McDonald

Northland College: Robert Parsonage, Steve Wammer

Northwest Nazarene University: Scott Armstrong, Edwin Crawford, Richard Hagood

Nova Southeastern University: Shannon Cain, Mark Cavanaugh, Ray Ferrero, Corey Johnson

Nyack College: Keith Davie, Michael Scales

Ohio Valley College: Peter Clark, Ron Pavan, Robert Stephens

Panhandle State University: John Goodwin, Dirk Hible, Kathy Turner

Peace College: Laura Bingham, Christian Dysart  
 Pennsylvania State University, Altoona: Brent Baird, BettyJean  
 Cale, William Cale, Fredina Ingold  
 Philadelphia College of the Bible: Sherrill Babb, Richard Beach  
 University of the Sciences in Philadelphia: Gayle Garrison, Philip  
 Gerbino, Laura Klimitas, Paul Klimitas, Robert Morgan, Joseph  
 Ruane  
 Piedmont College: Ray Cleere, Ken Melichar, Renee VanWinkle  
 University of Pittsburgh, Greensburg: Frank Cassell, Dan Swalga  
 University of Puerto Rico, Bayamon: Rose Hernandez, Luis Reeves,  
 Carmen Rivera, Doriscelis Roura, Carmen Skerrett  
 University of Puerto Rico, Cayey: Ivonne Bayron, Luis Bonilla, Juan  
 Figueroa, Agustin Flores, Ismael Ramos, Rafael Rivera-Lehman,  
 Aleksandra Ruiz  
 University of Puerto Rico, Humacao: Enoc Diaz, David Ferrer,  
 Roberto Marrero  
 University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez: Hector Figueroa, Briseida  
 Melendez, Marta Mora, Sylvia Pabon, Manuel Ramirez, Ana  
 Rodriguez, Karen Soto, Zuma Toro Ramos, Norma Torres  
 University of Puerto Rico-Rio Piedras: David Aleman, Jose Estrada,  
 George Hillyer, Ray Quijones, Farah Ramirez

Rogers State University: Barry Knight, Joe Wiley

St. Thomas Aquinas College: Mary Ellen Ferraro, Margaret  
 Fitzpatrick, Dennis O'Donnell, Gerald Oswald, Barbara Vano  
 St. Thomas University (Florida): Ted Abernethy  
 Schreiner College: Sam Junkin, Barry Shaw  
 Seattle University: Todd Schilperoort, Stephen Sundborg, Andre  
 Yandl  
 Spelman College: Barbara Brown, Audrey Manley, Dorothy Richey

Teikyo Post University: Jon Jay DeTemple, Dan Mara  
 University of Texas at Dallas: Kurt Beron, John Jackson, Franklyn  
 Jenifer, Mary Walters  
 Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi: Wayne Bridgeman, Dan Viola  
 Thomas College: Robert Bogiovanni, David Thombs, Christopher  
 Young  
 Tiffin University: Ian Day, George Kidd, John Miller  
 Transylvania University: Brian Austin, Charles Shearer

University of Virginia's College at Wise: George Culbertson, Wayne  
 Edwards, Gary Juhan, Ray Spenilla

Wilmington College (Delaware): Bud Livingston, Clint Robertson,  
 Jack Vinokur

## **Affiliated Members**

College Gymnastics Association: Richard Aronson

Division I-A Athletics Directors Association: Dutch Baughman

National Association of Basketball Coaches: Jim Haney, Reggie Minton

National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA): Mike Cleary, Pat Manak, Bob Vecchione

National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators (NACWAA): Jennifer Alley

National Federation of State High School Associations (NFSHSA): John Black, Robert Kanaby

U.S. Olympic Committee: Curt Hamakawa, Don Whittle

Women's Basketball Coaches Association: Betty Jaynes, Shannon Reynolds

## **Corresponding Members**

Pratt Institute: Dave Adebajo, Michael Chapman

## **Visitors**

Bond, Schoeneck & King, LLP: Michael Glazier, Stephen Morgan

Host Communications: James Host

Ice Miller: Rich Hillard, Carrie McCain, Kevin Pearson, Angel Shelton

Nike, Inc.: Kit Morris, Joan Scott

Ropes & Gray: Dennis Coleman

St. Petersburg/Clearwater Area Convention and Visitors Bureau: John Giantonio

The Compliance Group: Chuck Smrt

The Fitch Group: Jerome Fitch

# ■ 95th Annual Convention Opening Business Session

**Sunday Afternoon, January 7, 2001**

The 95th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order at 4:30 p.m. by NCAA Executive Committee Chair Charles T. Wethington, president of the University of Kentucky.

## **OPENING REMARKS**

**Mr. Wethington:** Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to welcome you to the opening session of the 2001 NCAA Convention. As chair of the NCAA Executive Committee, I have the pleasure of leading this opening session.

The chairs of the other three presidential governing bodies are with me on the dais today. I am pleased to welcome Graham Spanier, Pennsylvania State University, president of the Division I Board of Directors; Gladys Styles-Johnston, University of Nebraska at Kearney, chair of the Division II Presidents Council; and Ann Die, Hendrix College, chair of the Division III Presidents Council. (Applause)

Also on the dais is Ced Dempsey, who will be introduced to you later, and our parliamentarians, Alan Chapman and Charles Welford. Also on the dais is Bridget Belgiovine, assistant chief of staff for Division III and the liaison to the Executive Committee. Will you join me in welcoming these individuals. (Applause)

## **REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**Mr. Wethington:** The federated governance structure provides each division the autonomy to address its varying and diverse issues. However, it is important to remember that we are still an association comprised of all three divisions.

The Executive Committee has the responsibility for oversight of the affairs of the Association. With that in mind, I would like to give you a brief report of the activities of the Executive Committee during this last year.

As you know, the Executive Committee, is comprised of the chief executive officers from all three divisions. The Executive Committee reviewed and reaffirmed its commitments to its four strategic planning priorities developed last year.

They are, first, to prepare student-athletes for leadership in a dynamic and diverse society. Second, to reinforce the values of fairness and integrity in intercollegiate athletics. Third, to increase access to higher education and enhance the collegiate experience; and

finally, to highlight the capacity of college sports to foster life-long learning and health.

These priorities have served as a framework for the Association's planning and budgeting efforts. It is the Executive Committee's intent to remain committed to them and to provide various Association entities the framework for trying to implement and accomplish their stated objectives.

Another primary role of the Executive Committee is to review and approve the Association's budget. Each of the three divisions reviews and approves its own divisional budget, but the Executive Committee is responsible for approving the Association's overall budget.

As a result of the significant budget impact of the Association's 11-year, \$6 billion television contract, the Committee requests of each division, as part of this strategic process plan, to present a three-year budget plan. The Committee will review those plans at its meeting later this week.

Another responsibility of the Executive Committee is to monitor litigation in which the Association is involved. I am pleased to be able to report that the number of active cases against the Association is down from three years ago and that the Association has had sustained success in defending traditional and continuing-eligibility rules.

The Association also recently was able to get an apparel manufacturer to dismiss its appeal of a ruling — a ruling that had occurred in the NCAA's favor in its antitrust lawsuit against us — without any cost to the Association and without compromising the NCAA's position that student-athletes should not be walking billboards for commercial entities.

These legal issues are often very complicated, they are hard to understand and they are challenging to resolve. However, we are committed to resolving them in a way that best serves the interests of the membership of the Association and the membership as a whole.

Another responsibility of the Executive Committee is to employ and assess the performance of the Association's president. I might add this is certainly a most significant responsibility of the Executive Committee. Last year, we articulated our expectations for the NCAA president and his staff. This year, we established a planning and performance evaluation process for the president that was implemented this last spring. Of course, all of this action was taken by having the complete support of Cedric Dempsey. Clearly, we want to demonstrate from the top that we are intending to be accountable in every way.

Finally, as you may recall, the primary purposes for restructuring the NCAA several years ago were to provide greater clarity of authority as to where and how the decisions are made within the Association and to create a structure whereby chief executive officers have primary responsibility for governing the Association. The

Executive Committee remains committed to its duties in addition to taking a leadership role in determining and advancing the Association's initiatives on behalf of its membership. The Executive Committee challenges the governance structure to support the Association's priorities and its work on behalf of the membership and its thousands of student-athletes.

One item of business that we traditionally conduct during this session is to hear the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. I ask delegates, visitors and our friends in the news media to please remain silent during the reading of the memorial resolutions.

May I present Charles Welford, faculty athletics representative at the University of Maryland, College Park. Dr. Welford.

### **REPORT OF THE MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE**

**Charles Welford** (University of Maryland, College Park): Mr. chairman, delegates and guests, at this time I would like to recognize the other members of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. They are: Mary Jo Gunning of Marywood University; Charlene Johnson, South Carolina State University; and Dr. Gary Nallan at the University of North Carolina, Asheville. I also want to acknowledge the substantial and valuable assistance we have received from Lori Braa, a member of the national office staff assigned to our committee.

The following is a list of those men and women who have passed away since we last met:

James H. Williams, Delaware State  
Bill Bowerman, Oregon  
Frank A. Zazula, North Dakota  
Stanley "Ramrod" Simpson, Middle Tennessee State  
Ed Doherty, Arizona State  
Jim Blevins, Alabama  
Mike Berticelli, Notre Dame  
Joan M. Payne, Pratt Institute  
Dave Bethany, Texas Southern  
James Rutter, Utah  
Robert Frscher, University of California, Los Angeles  
Sever Toretti, Penn State  
Paul Manasseh, Louisiana State University  
Bernard L. Hickman, Louisville  
Bruce Johnson, Wofford  
Howard R. DeNike, East Stroudsburg  
Maurice Butie, Minnesota  
Joe Mullaney, Providence  
Herman Wells, Indiana University  
John Wayland Campbell, Western State  
Morris B. Abram, Brandeis  
Richard Twohy, Gonzaga  
Bob Blackman, Dartmouth

Dick Harp, Kansas  
Charles Bafaro, Pacific-Oregon  
Ralph Hargett, Wingate  
Bill Ellington, Texas  
Dick Kishpauh, Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Conference  
J. Eugene Smith, Eastern Connecticut State  
Patrick Filley, Cornell  
Robert Scott, Alabama  
Irvin R. Schmid, Springfield  
Steve Belko, Big Sky Conference  
Tom McNeer, Virginia Tech  
Bill Musselman, Ashland  
Gary Castaline, Rutgers  
Charles Caldwell, Tennessee  
Fred Collins, Grambling  
Thomas H. McGrath, Sonoma State  
William Micheels, Wisconsin Stout  
Arthur E. Reichle Jr., University of California, Los Angeles  
S. Walter Martin, Emory  
Clayton Brooks, Redlands  
Emil Parker, Davidson  
Roger Ouderkirk, St. John's  
Everett Needham Case, Colgate  
Bobby Holloway, Tennessee Tech  
Lester Dye, Syracuse  
Vern Wagner, Washington  
Miller A.F. Ritchie, Pacific-Oregon  
Bill Sudeck, Case Western Reserve  
Yvette Moorehead, George Washington  
Paul Pearson, Miami-Ohio  
Brenda Reilly, Central Connecticut State  
Robert Watson, Harvard  
Lou McCullough, Trans America Athletic Conference  
William Sharwell, Pace  
Frances Koeing, Central Michigan  
Vern Wolfe, University of Southern California  
Stanley Golloway, Southeastern Louisiana  
John W. Kissel, Hilbert  
Gary Crompton, Weber State  
Thomas Hay, Springfield  
Jean Bell Chandler, Clark Atlanta  
Wilford Bailey, Auburn  
Jack Horenberger, Illinois Wesleyan  
Robert Guillot, North Alabama  
Mike English, Wyoming  
The following are student-athletes:  
Ulises Charon, Upper Iowa



Molly Hatcher, Kenyon  
Sean Earl, Loyola-Illinois  
Johnnaya Peer, Arkansas-Pine Bluff  
Ricardo Tillman, Jacksonville  
Adam Padgett, Nicholls State  
Brandon Rouse, Clemson  
Terry Nochiols, Texas A&M  
Rufus Leach, Appalachian State  
Anthony Bates, Kansas State  
Preston Birdsong, Tennessee Tech  
Jorge Heemsem, Rollins  
Lynn Pastucha, Bradley  
A. J. Cohen, Dayton

Please stand and observe a moment of silence for those who have gone before us. Thank you.

If you know of persons who should be added to the list, please contact a member of the committee or the national office staff. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Wethington:** Thank you, Dr. Welford. Now, it is my pleasure to introduce our president, Ced Dempsey. As many of you know, Ced Dempsey is the person who has been providing the very strong leadership that is expected by the Executive Committee and by the Association. He continues to be a person, and I say this very often, who is completely dedicated to the welfare of the student-athlete.

I know of no one more dedicated to the welfare of the student-athlete than Ced Dempsey. He continues to be willing to ably take on the major issues that confront the Association. In short, he is doing what is expected of the CEO for an organization like this one.

Today, he comes before you again to present his State of the Association address. So it is my real pleasure to introduce the president of the NCAA, Ced Dempsey. (Applause)

## STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

**President Dempsey:** Thank you, President Wethington. Good afternoon. I was afraid that he first was going into my performance evaluation. I didn't want him to do that.

Charles Dickens began his novel "A Tale of Two Cities" with these now-famous words:

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times — it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness..."

As we begin the first century of the new millennium, there are some who would argue that those words fairly describe the state of this Association in January 2001.

Certainly, college sports have never been more popular. We continue to set attendance records for both football and basketball in all divisions. More student-athletes are participating in athletics than ever before — some 360,000 of them last year alone.

A little more than a year ago, we signed a minimum \$6 billion tel-

evision and marketing contract that will assure continued championships, student-athlete support programs and other services well into the next decade.

Right now, we are offering more championship opportunities than ever before, and when this academic year is over, more than 42,000 student-athletes will have competed for the title of national collegiate champion. That figure has nearly doubled in the last decade. In fact, we are very close to providing an equal number of opportunities for both men and women.

Across all three divisions, we are graduating student-athletes at a higher rate than the rest of the student body.

We have recognized that one style of governance does not fit all and have federated in a way that allows each division to address its issues in a distinctly unique way. At the same time, we retain an umbrella structure that approaches Association-wide issues with a united front.

Indeed, intercollegiate athletics programs have helped campuses attract new students, new revenue sources, new facilities — and some would even say a new status as an institution of higher education.

Surely then, this must be the best of times in an age of wisdom. In fact, I would venture to guess that some college presidents and ADs would say they never had it so good.

And yet, as a collective enterprise, critics and even our enlightened supporters would suggest that the times are fraught with issues, problems, contradictions and complexities that threaten to undermine college sports. There are those who would argue that the entire endeavor may soon simply implode — and cave in on itself.

Clearly, the rising revenues on most campuses have been overwhelmed by even higher costs. At the more than 970 NCAA member institutions, we are bringing in just over \$3 billion a year, but we are spending \$4.1 billion in that same period.

Pressure to keep up with the Joneses and truly be competitive has pushed many athletics programs and their institutions into great debt.

While graduation rates for student-athletes as a whole are at an all-time high, football and men's basketball participants are not keeping pace.

We have made real progress at providing equitable opportunities for women to participate. Sometimes that progress has been at the expense of male student-athletes who want to compete, but who have had their programs pulled out from under them.

We have regulated ourselves into paralysis. We no longer seem able to stop ourselves from abusing the spirit of sport and instead rely on legislation to keep us in check.

While salaries for coaches in Division I football and men's basketball have reached levels difficult to defend, many of our other programs have been relegated to the leadership of part-time or volunteer

coaches. We recruit student-athletes, hire coaches and make decisions for the short term without much analysis of how those behaviors might shape the future.

Indeed, there is plenty of evidence for critics of college sports to argue that these are the worst of times in an age of foolishness.

So then, who is right? As we sit here today, what is the state of college athletics?

Well, we are truly blessed with very good fortune. But there are plenty of real issues to which we must attend. I am going to touch on four issues this afternoon that will occupy my personal attention over the next couple of years.

First, football and basketball issues, which I will treat as one objective.

Second, amateurism deregulation.

Third, the financial health of our programs.

And fourth, the education of our prime stakeholders.

First, let me give you an update on plans for a comprehensive football issue study in Division I. At its November meeting, the Board of Directors approved this study. It also appointed a small group to set the protocol for the study and determine who would be on the committee making the study. All of that will be announced after the Board meeting tomorrow afternoon.

As all of you know, I have pushed for this study and there has been considerable disagreement over whether it should be done at all. To help settle some fears, let me tell you what won't be included in the review. It will not explore a postseason championship in Division I-A, and it will not examine how current postseason bowl revenues in I-A are distributed.

At no time during the discussion of this study have I suggested it should include consideration of a I-A playoff. Frankly, I have spoken on this topic in the past, and the Board has been clear that it doesn't want to discuss a playoff, and I don't intend to bring it up again.

However, I do believe football deserves the same comprehensive review that basketball has undertaken. We need to examine the basis upon which membership criteria are established among the subdivisions. Not only is this important with regard to how programs are structured, it is equally important with regard to how Division I governance is structured.

We need to look at declining graduation rates in football with the same educational scrutiny that we have given to basketball. The graduation rates in Division I-A football fell three percentage points in the last year and fell eight percentage points in the last five years. What incentives can we bring to bear to improve those rates?

We need to review and examine the costs associated with football. The latest revenues and expenses research tells us that football, more than any other sport, may be the major factor that widens the gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots."

As you know, football is the sport responsible for the creation of

the NCAA and, to a great extent, it's the sport that shaped the perception of the college campus. As one of the two sports that helped finance all other Division I athletics programs, this Association must pay attention to it.

Basketball — the other half of this first initiative — underwent a similar study two years ago. From that study has come legislation to address specific concerns about graduation rates, sports wagering and recruiting.

What also emerged was a clear message that the Division I Board of Directors does not intend to tolerate the current summer evaluation structure. That structure puts prospects at risk — it makes NCAA coaches beholden to individuals outside the education community — and it allows shoe companies to leverage their financial influence and dictate where prospects should go to college. Fixing that structure and changing that environment is not an easy task. More stringent certification of summer events and greater financial disclosure are among the specific proposals that Division I will hear more about tomorrow.

This is a very complex issue, and it is one that isn't likely to respond only to regulatory efforts. In the long run, education may be the real key to success.

We have to make sure that every time prospects come together at a summer camp or tournament there is powerful and engaging communication about making good choices, about how young people can be exploited, about the value of a college degree, and about what a day in the life of a student-athlete is going to be like.

We need a strong mentoring program that identifies future prospects at an early age, puts them in touch and keeps them in touch with people who will guide them without an interest in where they go to college and what their future salaries might be.

We need to get NCAA coaches involved at an earlier point in the lives of these prospects — not just to assess the potential for successfully recruiting them, but to be a source of information and guidance. We need every coach to be a mentor, a teacher, a counselor and a confidant.

Right now, these efforts are handicapped with obstacles and concerns about recruiting advantages and distrust among coaches. That is our real nemesis. One of our biggest tests will be whether we can set aside our distrust and suspicions and act only in the best interests of prospective student-athletes.

"Acting in the best interests" of these young people is also central to the second initiative I want to touch on today — amateurism deregulation.

For the last three years, committees within the governance structure in both Division I and Division II have been working on deregulation of the Association's amateurism rules. Division II will vote on Proposal No. 12 during tomorrow's business session. The Division I Management Council has sent a similar legislative package to its

membership for comment, and that division will have a chance to discuss the package during tomorrow's forum. Division III is beginning to make the same examination for its member schools.

Before I go further, allow me to publicly thank the chairs of the two committees who have worked so hard this summer on amateurism deregulation. Carol Dunn in Division II, Christine Grant in Division I — and their colleagues — have been real pioneers in plowing ground that largely has been untouched for more than a century. Please join me in acknowledging their good work. (Applause)

The prognosis for passage in Division II is favorable — the outcome is not so clear in Division I. And this won't be the first time Division II has led the way with deregulation. In fact, that division has made greater strides over the last few years in trimming the vines from our bureaucratic tangle. Division II should be applauded for these efforts. (Applause)

To be fair, not all circumstances are the same among the three divisions. That, of course, is the reason we have federated our governance structure. Members of each division must give open, purposeful and specific consideration of proposals as they arise.

But let me say this: This particular deregulation effort has come about because you have identified what you consider to be injustices in the current legislation. You have asked for special treatment for individuals who by rule are no longer amateurs, but who by intent clearly abide by the spirit of amateurism. And many of those requests have been granted.

You have suggested that intercollegiate athletics should be less concerned about what student-athletes do before they enroll than after matriculation. You have even agreed that becoming a professional in one sport doesn't professionalize an individual in all sports. In short, you have said that our amateurism rules are imperfect.

Well, it isn't likely we are going to get them perfect. It isn't likely that any deregulation package is going to be the perfect solution, but this package includes a number of accommodations for specific sports that have been brought to the attention of the subcommittee.

We can all agree, however, that the current system needs to be fixed, and I believe that the proposed deregulation package in Divisions I and II is the best solution I have seen so far.

I will tell you we shouldn't forego making progress because of a distrusting unwillingness to accept less than the perfect solution. We should approve the pre-enrollment proposals in Division II tomorrow, and I see no reason why Division I shouldn't do the same later this year.

I understand that the answer for Division I may be to let Division II lead the way. Or, the answer for Division I may be to incrementally — and perhaps Division I will make no changes at all — make deregulation progress with our amateurism rules.

If that is the case, I suggest we should reconsider the inconsistent eligibility reinstatement standards we have today. We get conflicting

messages from our members who want us to bend the rules on one hand, while maintaining a rigid, and perhaps archaic — definition of “cradle-to-grave amateurism” on the other. More to the point, why should we continue to reinstate student-athletes for exactly the same set of circumstances that we are unwilling to correct through deregulation?

I am not suggesting that we abandon principles — but I do suggest that we either live by them all the time or adjust them for the times.

The third initiative I want to address is our obligation as financial stewards. If there is one single place where Dickens’ words ring true for college sports, it is here. According to the latest research on revenues and expenses in Divisions I and II, these are the best of times and the worst of times.

The number of programs in Division I-A, for example, where revenues exceed expenses without institutional support, grew from 43 schools to 48 schools from 1997 to 1999. But the relative success of those few is enormously greater. Profits for those institutions more than doubled, increasing by 124 percent, from \$1.7 million a year to \$3.8 million on average, but deficits for the remaining schools also increased by nearly 18 percent. And in the rest of Division I and all of Division II, expenses continued to outpace revenues.

And as I mentioned at the beginning, if you look at all three divisions, the difference between expenses and revenues is a little more than \$1 billion. That’s right, \$1 billion.

The tough question, of course, is how much longer institutional funds can support increasing deficits? How many new revenue streams can we develop to cover the difference, and what will be the cost of these new funds to our institutional integrity? The level of cynicism over the commercialization of our most visible athletics programs has reached epidemic proportions — especially among those constituents we value most, our student-athletes.

Our efforts at controlling costs have consistently been overwhelmed before we even get started. And legal challenges that rightly protect individual freedom have relegated organization-wide efforts to the insignificant.

What is the solution?

We need to engage all of higher education to design a new model for financial management. I am going to call on the Knight Commission and other higher education organizations to help us study our practices and help find new approaches.

A modest start for Division I may be a change in the philosophy that since 1978 has expected athletics programs to be self-sustaining. Not only has that philosophy been less than effective, it has the psychological effect of pushing accountability for the athletics programs away from campus scrutiny — exactly the opposite of what we hoped to accomplish.

The result is that too many athletics administrators are walking

a financial high-wire with no net as they try to balance the books. We may very well be setting ourselves up for a huge financial fall unless we find a way to control our costs.

The final initiative I want to discuss is one I believe is essential if we are going to live up to our mission. We must engage in an unprecedented educational effort that protects the mission of higher education and the welfare of student-athletes as our top priorities.

You know in August, at the conclusion of the first day of testimony before the reconvened Knight Commission, one of its members noted that we probably have gone about as far as we can reforming college sports through legislation. “Now,” he said, “we have to address the culture.”

I believe he is right, and I believe the answer is a strong educational program for our primary stakeholders.

The framework is in place for university CEOs and governing boards to set an agenda for intercollegiate athletics that puts education first, not winning first — one that puts managing costs on par with generating revenue, that sets recruiting standards to achieve academic success, not just athletics success, and that understands the value of a diverse staff more than a color and gender scheme that perpetuates the status quo.

The regulatory framework is in place. So what is missing?

Today, I am not sure we know what our mission is in intercollegiate athletics. If I asked you to recite the mission or the 16 principles of the Association, I doubt you could do it and I am not sure I could, either.

Gen. Palmer A. Pierce, superintendent of the United States Military Academy and the first and long-time president of the NCAA, used to open this Convention each and every year by reciting those principles and purposes to the delegates. Every year, he would read the 16 principles.

I think he was on to something. I think he understood, that left to our own devices, we tend to redefine principles according to what works best for individual programs on individual campuses. Perhaps he understood that we need to re-educate ourselves annually to those things we must hold common among us if we are to preserve a culture that ties this enterprise to the classroom and the student.

In the next few months, I will set forth a plan to educate institutional chief executive officers, members of governing boards, faculty, directors of athletics, senior woman administrators, conference commissioners, coaches and student-athletes. The curriculum will focus on ethics, academic integrity and the philosophy of intercollegiate sport.

Success will be a change in culture that reassesses the goals and priorities of athletics personnel, that realigns them with a standard set of principles, and then — and this is the most important element — bases performance evaluations on these new goals.

I am committed to this effort. Again, I am going to call on higher

education organizations, the Knight Commission, the governance bodies in all three divisions and each of you personally to assist in this initiative.

This may be the most important thing we do in intercollegiate athletics as we approach the centennial of this Association in 2006 and prepare for our second century. If we asked the general public — those who support higher education and college sports — about those 16 principles, they couldn't recite them, either. But they intuitively know that in too many instances we are missing the mark.

In 1930, Yale University President James R. Angell presented to the NCAA Convention what he called his "Creed on Athletics Issues."

In his closing comments he told the delegates this:

"I do not believe that collegiate relationships are, or can be, bettered by intercollegiate athletics unless these are conducted with complete mutual respect and confidence on the part of participating institutions."

He said, "The distrust that now too often occurs is altogether poisonous and intolerable and, if generally justified, would be a fatal indictment of such athletics as now conducted."

That was in 1930. Seventy-one years later, President Angell's words still apply.

We must trust one another, but first we must be trustworthy. That is our challenge. We must prove ourselves trustworthy to the public, the media, our institutions and, most important, to our student-athletes.

Success in intercollegiate athletics is up to us. Will this be our age of wisdom or the age of foolishness? Will we take full advantage of the best of times to assure that we are never faced with only the worst of times?

The task before us, then, is to examine our culture, our principles, our values, our processes — to align them with what we and our public know to be our mission — and then find the discipline and the strong heart to achieve success based on the only thing that matters — the total development of student-athletes.

In closing, let me say this: I have spoken with you today with great candor, and I know I have raised issues not comfortably discussed, but I do so with great trust and great confidence, that together with our collective wisdom, we truly can make these times the best of times.

Thank you. (Applause)

**Mr. Wethington:** Thank you, Ced. You have challenged this Association. You always challenge this Association. I believe this year you have done that particularly well. On behalf of all of us, I would like to again, one, thank you for your leadership, and two, thank you for laying out what I believe are the principle issues facing intercollegiate athletics. (Applause)

I introduced earlier in the program today those individuals to my right who have been providing leadership in the three divisions for



the past two years. I would like to again commend Graham Spanier, Gladys and Ann for the leadership they have provided for Divisions I, II and III during the last two years I have been chair of the Executive Committee.

These three individuals have really provided exceptional presidential leadership for the three divisions of this Association. I would like you to join me again in thanking them. (Applause)

It happens that all three are going out of leadership roles at the same time. I can assure you that they are going to be very much missed. They are still going to be here and be a part of the Association, but they no longer will chair the three divisions. I really believe they have done an exceptional job.

Don't forget, we have our Honors Dinner tonight at 7:30. Delegates and guests are reminded tickets for this year's event will be collected at the door, so please take your ticket with you when you go. Please reference the schedule in your Convention Program for your divisional business sessions and forums.

Ced informs me that we have a crowd that is considerably larger at this Convention in attendance than we have had for the past several years. Please take advantage of the Convention Program while you are here.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your attention. Enjoy the Convention. This session is adjourned.

[The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.]



# ■ NCAA Honors Dinner

**Sunday Evening, January 7, 2001**

## **WELCOME**

**Charles Wethington** (NCAA Executive Chair/University of Kentucky): Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Tonight we celebrate the 36th NCAA Honors Dinner, and it is my pleasure to welcome you to this prestigious affair. We will begin tonight with the invocation and dinner, followed by the presentation of the 2001 NCAA honorees.

Delivering tonight's invocation is the vice-chair of the Division I Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and a member of the Columbia University women's lacrosse team. Please welcome Miss Bola Bamidura.

## **INVOCATION**

**Bola Bamidura** (Columbia University): Let us thank our higher power for allowing all of us to share in this very special moment. We are thankful for the opportunity to be here in the presence of people with such outstanding talent. Commitment, dedication and hard work are qualities that those being recognized tonight possess. Allow them to continue to use these qualities to find success and achievement in future endeavors.

In addition, allow each one of us the foresight to take risks, to give our all, and never give up, in the hopes of obtaining our intended goal.

Please enjoy your meal.

[Dinner was served.]

**Mr. Wethington:** Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it has been my pleasure as the chair of the NCAA Executive Committee to have the opportunity to take part in the honors program for the past two years. To stand here among these extraordinary past and present student-athletes has been one of the many highlights I have experienced as the committee chair, and it will be my honor to stand here tonight to help celebrate these accomplished individuals.

The individuals we honor tonight embody the spirit of athletics as they are meant to be. But more importantly, they have taken this spirit further — further into their communities — to charities, to schools and into their professions.

Tonight, we look into the lives of 18 individuals. While they may have played different sports, they all share something quite remarkable. Yes, athletics excellence is one bond they share. But it is their giving spirit and their leadership that makes each a true champion.

Tonight, we will honor an impressive group of young student-ath-

letes. We will also take a look at the contributions of six student-athletes 25 years after graduation. We will hear about heroics and the true meaning of teamwork. Finally, we bestow the NCAA's highest honor on one outstanding individual with the Theodore Roosevelt Award. You will no doubt be both impressed and inspired by each of them.

Tonight, we celebrate a gold medal Olympian, an NBA general manager, NCAA national champions, entrepreneurs, athletics directors, and leaders in national government. They are also champions, humanitarians and heroes.

Before we begin, I would like to introduce two very important people who make this evening possible. First, is the chair of the NCAA Honors Committee, who along with his committee, had the difficult task of selecting tonight's honorees and planning tonight's program, Robert Steitz, associate commissioner of the Atlantic 10 Conference.

Bob, will you please stand so we can applaud you. (Applause)

Also on the dias with us tonight is a man who has dedicated his career to collegiate athletics and serves today at the helm of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Please join me in welcoming the president of the NCAA, Cedric Dempsey. (Applause)

## **INTRODUCTION OF THE MASTER OF CEREMONIES**

**Mr. Wethington:** Tonight's master of ceremonies certainly has a great deal in common with this year's honorees. Not only is he an Emmy winner, but he is also a former Silver Anniversary Award winner. Jack Ford can be seen almost daily as an anchor and correspondent for ABC News.

Prior to his television career, Jack was a three-year football starter as a defensive back at Yale University.

After graduation, Jack pursued a law degree and later served five years as chief legal correspondent for NBC News before moving to ABC in 1999. Four years after the NCAA first honored Jack Ford, host Mark McEwen's words still ring true. In fact, add the 1998 National Father of the Year Award to the resume of this decorated athlete, lawyer and journalist.

**Mark McEwen (By Video):** This next gentleman is the only athlete here tonight who I watch every Saturday and Sunday. He is an excellent broadcaster and even more an excellent human being.

Jack Ford began his unbroken string of success as a three-year starter on the Yale defense, where he displayed the same bruising intensity that would later mark his professional life. Ford went on to become a successful lawyer in New Jersey. He later became a network legal analyst and reporter, first with NBC and now with ABC, where he anchors "Good Morning America." His journalistic and legal expertise were put to the test during the recent presidential election. He is one Jack who's truly a master of all trades.

**Mr. Wethington:** Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to

introduce tonight's emcee, Jack Ford. (Applause)

## **TODAY'S TOP VIII AWARDS**

**Jack Ford:** Charles, thank you very much. When I was asked to act as the emcee this evening, I was absolutely delighted for a number of reasons. I did have the opportunity four years ago to be a part of this evening as a Silver Anniversary Award winner. I was struck at the time by the nature and the spirit of this night.

I'll tell you a true story. My children were with me at the time. My daughter, who is now a freshman at Yale University, where she is a member of the varsity lacrosse team, was a freshman in high school. Our son was 10 years old. Given the nature of my business, they had had an opportunity to travel around and meet an extraordinary array of people. But they had never been as impressed after an event as they were after this event.

I made the point of giving each of them a chance to meet not only the other Silver Anniversary Award winners, but more importantly, to meet the Top VIII winners. When it was over, I sat down and I said to the two of them, "What did you think about those people?" They both said independently that they were just astonished that the winners could be so accomplished on the athletic field and in the classroom and be such good people at the same time.

I thought if it can make that impression on a 10-year-old and a 14-year-old, that this truly is an event to be a part of. I was glad to come down.

I recall watching a number of the Silver Anniversary Award winners and being in awe of them then, and am much more impressed now after seeing what they have accomplished in their lives. And the Top VIII Award winners, who are just a wonderful array of young people, it was a great opportunity to meet them.

But the real reason was this: In my profession, we are essentially the chronicle of society. We watch, we listen, we ask questions, and eventually we become the conduit for information and for understanding for people. But the sad fact is, that we often chronicle the worst in our society.

I have spent years sitting in courtrooms looking into the eyes of people like Timothy McVeigh standing in front of the remnants from the destruction he caused, looking into the eyes of Theodore Kaczynski, the "Unabomber," and say how can someone so wantonly and willfully take the lives of others?

So for me, it is such a wonderful opportunity to have a chance to chronicle the best in our society, which is what this evening is all about. You have come face to face with the true student-athletes who bring with them hope, idealism and success. So it is a great opportunity for me to say let's be a part of this celebration tonight.

I would pass this on to the Silver Anniversary winners — having been here four years ago — it is an opportunity for some humbling moments. I remember sitting with Tommy Casanova, the great LSU

football player four years ago. We looked at each other and we said: "Why are our films in black and white? Did they even have color back when we were playing?" Not to mention the hair styles. Guys, we will talk about those in a little while. I promise you all that.

I have a quick story that sort of brings it all back to a level that we can appreciate. When I was advised by the NCAA that I was to be a member of Silver Anniversary winners, I got home that night and I sat down with my family. I think I told this story, as a matter of fact, four years ago. We sat down and we talked. I said this is a great thing. We will all go to the NCAA Honors Dinner. I explained this concept of the Silver Anniversary Award. My 10-year-old son at the time listened very carefully, and with that marvelous clarity of wisdom that resides in the mind of a 10-year-old, he said: "That is great, dad, but how do you deal with the bad news?" I said: "What bad news is that?" He said: "The fact that you played your last college football game a quarter of a century ago."

Silver Anniversary Award winners, I assure you we are not here to celebrate merely the passage of time. It is a great opportunity for me to be part of an evening that for those who have been here before know what I am talking about. For those of you who are experiencing this for the first time, you will leave here tonight in awe of these award winners and for very good reason.

Tonight, I am going to have the pleasure of introducing you to Today's Top VIII Award winners, the Silver Anniversary Award honorees, an extraordinary Award of Valor recipient, and finally, our 2001 Theodore Roosevelt Award winner.

We will begin tonight with Today's Top VIII Award winners, an extraordinary array of accomplished individuals. Our first honoree this evening is Drew Brees, Purdue University. (Applause)

As a top Heisman Trophy contender, you have no doubt heard about Drew's excellence on the football field establishing numerous Big Ten and Purdue passing records. But he has also made plenty of great plays in the classroom, making the dean's list three out of the last four semesters, and in the community, where he perhaps has his greatest impact making visits to elementary schools as part of Purdue's "Gentle Giants Program."

**Audiovisual Recording:** To reach Pasadena, Purdue needed a big lift from a strong breeze, as in Quarterback Drew Brees. Everything seemed to come up roses during Brees' career. His success started in 1998 when he was named the Big Ten player of the year. By this season, when Brees earned that honor a second time, he had become the all-time conference leader in completions, yards and touchdowns. All told, he accounted for over 12,000 yards of total offense.

Brees is just as capable of putting up gaudy numbers in the classroom, as his 3.42 GPA suggests. But stats don't tell the whole story of Drew Brees, because numbers don't measure the way he turned Purdue into a Big Ten power. This year, Brees closed his career by lead-

ing the Boilermakers to their first Rose Bowl appearance since 1967.

**Mr. Ford:** Receiving his Top VIII Award from Morgan Burke, athletics director, Purdue University, ladies and gentlemen, please join me in congratulating Drew Brees. (Applause)

Our next honoree is Matthew Busbee, Auburn University. (Applause) Matthew is a 14-time all-American and a three-time NCAA 200-meter freestyle relay champion. His success in the pool led the Auburn Tigers to two national championship titles.

Graduating with summa cum laude honors, Matthew received the NCAA Walter Byers postgraduate scholarship and is now enrolled in medical school.

**Audiovisual Recording:** What's all the buzz about? It is about Matthew Busbee, who has been busy the last four years rewriting the record books at Auburn's Martin Aquatics Center. Busbee, a finalist for the AAU's Sullivan Award as the nation's top amateur athlete, made his mark as an explosive sprinter and ranked among the world's top 10 in the 50-meter freestyle.

Busbee was also a buzzsaw in the classroom, where he posted a 3.86 grade-point average. This year, he has traded in his swimsuits for hospital scrubs as a first-year medical student at the University of Alabama. But while Busbee may be playing for the enemy now, the Auburn faithful won't soon forget his work in the pool, where he anchored a freestyle relay team at the 2000 NCAA championships that set a new record and won his Tigers a national title.

**Mr. Ford:** Receiving his Top VIII Award from Dr. William Muse, president, Auburn University, ladies and gentlemen, Matthew Busbee. (Applause)

Our next honoree is Alia Fischer, Washington University. (Applause) The two-year team captain of the women's basketball team, Alia catapulted her team to three NCAA championships. Graduating with nine school records in her possession, Alia was recently honored as a 2000 NCAA Woman of the Year top 10 finalist for her performances on the court, in the classroom, and perhaps more importantly, in her community.

**Audiovisual Recording:** Few student-athletes have enjoyed as much individual success as Alia Fischer of Washington University. In the classroom, Fischer earned dean's list honors every semester. On the basketball court, Fischer was named the Division III player of the year for three consecutive seasons.

She graduated as the school's all-time leader in points, rebounds, blocked shots and field goal percentage. But perhaps the truest test of a champion, she turned that individual excellence into team success. And that is where Fischer really left a mark, guiding the Bears to three consecutive National titles and 68 straight victories. (Applause)

**Mr. Ford:** Receiving her Top VIII Award from John Schael, athletics director at Washington University, ladies and gentlemen, Alia Fischer. (Applause)

Our next award winner this evening is Andrea Garner, Pennsylvania State University. (Applause)

Graduation did not end Andrea's life-long passion for basketball. She made it a career, playing for the WNBA's Seattle Storm. As Penn State's team captain, Andrea led the team to an NCAA Final Four appearance last year.

Along with her passion for basketball, Andrea also has a passion for helping others, volunteering, among other things, for three years to help disabled children learn to ride horses.

**Audiovisual Recording:** During her career at Penn State University, Andrea Garner picked up her fair share of accolades. Among the awards she "garnered" was USA Today's national player-of-the-year award last year, a season in which she led the Nittany Lions to their first Final Four appearance.

Garner was an inside force on both ends of the floor, leading Penn State in scoring and leading the Big Ten in blocks. Garner was a two-time selection to the all-conference first team, and she ranks in the top 10 of virtually every Penn State career chart.

After graduating with a 3.41 GPA in marketing, Garner has gone on to the WNBA, where she now plays for the Seattle Storm.

**Mr. Ford:** Receiving her Top VIII Award from Dr. Graham Spanier, the president of Pennsylvania State University, ladies and gentlemen, Andrea Garner. (Applause)

Our next recipient is Kristy Kowal, University of Georgia. (Applause)

Kristy earned her spot on the U.S. Olympic Team by shattering an eight-year-old American record in the 200-meter breaststroke. During her career, she has broken one world and eight American records.

When she is out of the water, she is usually out in the community, recently receiving the "Peach of an Athlete" award from the Atlanta Boy Scouts for her community service efforts.

**Audiovisual Recording:** If Kristy Kowal knows one thing, it's how to celebrate a millennium. In 2000, Kowal had the kind of year that most people can only dream about. In the spring, she guided the University of Georgia to its second straight national championship, while adding to her personal stash of seven national titles — the most by any athlete in the school's history.

In the summer, Kowal took her victory tour on the road, all the way to Sydney, where she earned an Olympic silver medal in her signature event, the 200-meter breaststroke. What to do for an encore? In Kowal's case, win the NCAA's Woman of the Year Award. With a grade-point average of 3.60 and a new world record to her name, Kowal showed there was no bug in her Y2K program for success. (Applause)

**Mr. Ford:** Receiving her Top VIII Award from Dr. Michael Adams, president, University of Georgia, ladies and gentlemen, Kristy Kowal. (Applause)



Our next recipient is Amanda Scott, California State University, Fresno.

Amanda has also had the good fortune to turn her love of sports into a profession. She was the Women's Professional Softball League's No. 1 draft pick. She also pitched her way into the NCAA record books, setting three top 10 NCAA all-time career pitching records.

When not on the diamond or in the classroom, Amanda spent her time volunteering at a local children's hospital.

**Audiovisual Recording:** Forget "Great Scott." Fresno State University has the greatest "Scott," at least when it comes to softball. Amanda Scott was a two-way threat who led the nation in earned-run average the last two seasons. She was also named the team's top clutch hitter.

Scott earned first team all-America honors four times. And just as impressive as Scott's low "ERA" was her high "GPA," as she graduated with honors in communications. As far as honors on the field, she was named MVP of the 1998 Women's College World Series after leading the Bulldogs to the national title. (Applause)

**Mr. Ford:** Receiving her Top VIII Award from Dr. Allen Bohl, athletics director, California State University, Fresno, ladies and gentlemen, please join me in congratulating Amanda Scott. (Applause)

Our next recipient is Josh Sims, Princeton University. (Applause)

During his college career, Josh led his lacrosse team to four Ivy League and two NCAA championship titles. A proven leader, Josh's accolades include being named Ivy League player of the year, College Lacrosse USA sportsman of the year, and the first Princetonian to receive the NCAA Top VIII Award. I might note personally that I mentioned this to Josh's mom and his grandmother that my 14-year old son, the son of a Yale football player, decided to idolize Josh Sims, a Princeton lacrosse player. No doubt I will be required to undergo some form of therapy at some point in time, Josh, but my congratulations, nonetheless. To his giving character, Josh has volunteered many hours for many causes, including pediatric AIDS causes.

**Audiovisual Recording:** How do you "sum up" the career of Josh Sims? Perhaps this says it best: During his four-year career at Princeton University, the team went undefeated in conference play, winning 24 consecutive games. Sims was the chief reason for that Tiger run, as he earned three first- team all-America honors and was twice named the nation's top fielder.

He provided "symmetry" on both ends of the field for the Tigers, and he ranks fifth on the school's all-time scoring chart with 103 career goals. Princeton's success with Sims wasn't confined to the Ivy League. He also guided the Tigers to two national titles before graduating with a 3.5 grade-point average last May. (Applause)

**Mr. Ford:** Receiving his Top VIII Award from William Tierney, head men's lacrosse coach, Princeton University, ladies and gentlemen, Josh Sims. (Applause)

Our next recipient is Kevin Listerman, Northern Kentucky University. (Applause)

As a starting point guard for four years, Kevin shattered about every record in NKU's books. His success and leadership skills were not reserved only, however, for the basketball court. He led other student-athletes by serving as chair of the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and leading many community service projects. Graduating summa cum laude, he is currently enrolled in graduate school with a 4.0 grade-point average.

**Audiovisual Recording:** Kevin Listerman's list of accomplishments is no quick read. Listerman, a four-year starter at point guard for Northern Kentucky University, guided the Norse to two national runner-up finishes in Division II basketball.

Defense was his hallmark, and he tops the school's all-time steals chart. Last year, after leading the squad in steals, rebounds, assists and minutes played, Listerman was named the team's most valuable player. While Listerman's performance on the court was near perfect, his effort in the classroom was perfect on several occasions.

He earned a 4.0 grade point in five different semesters and graduated summa cum laude with a degree in biology and secondary education. (Applause)

**Mr. Ford:** Receiving his Top VIII Award from Dr. James Votruba, who is the president of Northern Kentucky University, ladies and gentlemen, Kevin Listerman. (Applause)

Kevin Listerman will now speak on behalf of Today's Top VIII student-athletes. Kevin.

**Kevin Listerman:** When they asked me to speak tonight, for the longest time I couldn't figure out why. When Ced walked in the room tonight, it dawned on me. You see, the first time that I met Ced Dempsey, we were here in Orlando at the NCAA Leadership Conference. We were on a bus going from one activity to another. He had his arm in a sling. After being with 300 student-athletes for four or five days, I'm sure the sling had to wear on him, and he was looking a little ragged.

I was seated in the front of this bus and there happened to be a microphone. I decided to lighten the mood. I did my impression of an airline steward doing pre-flight — the whole nine yards, the white lights, the red lights, the emergency exit, and the mask, the whole nine yards. So in the end, Ced felt much, much better. But the real reason is if he didn't let me speak tonight, he was very afraid what might happen. (Laughter)

In all honesty, I am humbled and honored to be standing here at this podium tonight speaking on behalf of the Top VIII recipients. It is rare to be surrounded by such decorated and talented athletes, yet tonight we are recognized more for the character we display than the talents we possess.

It has been my pleasure to meet these outstanding individuals who are truly better people than they are athletes. Ladies and gen-

tlemen, please join me in congratulating tonight's honorees. (Applause)

When I was about six or seven, I used to take my basketball and go out into the side yard where I would play. There is one thing you have to understand about my basketball hoop at home. My dad is a high-school coach. He decided that the best way for me to learn how to dribble a basketball was not on blacktop, it was not on concrete, dirt or grass, but gravel. Obviously, it worked.

It was a wonderful experience. It cost me a couple of teeth in the end, but everything is okay. I used to go out on that court and imagine I was playing in a packed arena with thousands of screaming fans. Of course, as a little kid, you are not only playing the game but you get to be the coach, the commentator and the crowd.

All the time, my "game" went like this: "Listerman brings the ball down the floor with five seconds to go, and his team trails by one. He crosses over, three, two, lets it fly...swish! The crowd goes wild! Listerman wins the national championship!

That was my dream.

Thanks to Northern Kentucky University and the NCAA, I had the opportunity to pursue and make that dream a near reality. I believe dreams are what we celebrate this evening. The individuals seated upon the stage not only pursued and achieved their athletic dreams, but modeled academic excellence and demonstrated character uncommon in today's world.

Although tonight we are honored as individuals, our successes have not been the result of some efforts. We owe a great debt of gratitude to all those who made this evening possible. First, I would like to thank almighty God for the physical and mental blessings that he has bestowed upon each of us.

Thank you to the NCAA for providing the framework within which we as athletes participate, and for holding fast to the ideals of sportsmanship, fair play and the development of character through competition. All of the institutions that participate as members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association deserve thanks for making the Association what it is and for providing opportunities for young people to pursue their athletics and academic dream.

The institutions represented on this stage deserve special thanks for their efforts on behalf of tonight's recipients and all of their student-athletes. Specifically, I would like to thank Northern Kentucky University, its president, James Votruba; athletics director Jane Meier; and faculty athletics representative Tom Kearns; my coach, Ken Shields; his assistants; and especially my teammates who have shared the dreams and triumphs of the last five years.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and all the families and loved ones of tonight's honorees. Their self-sacrifice, guidance and friendship has helped us become the people we are today. I said that tonight we celebrate dreams, and what better time than now? What better place than Disney World for each of us in this room to recog-

nize and accept the awesome responsibility to continue pursuing our dreams with undying passion, and more importantly, to inspire the dreams of others, to provide opportunities to achieve those dreams, and then win or lose, applaud those individuals for their efforts? If you need an example of how to inspire and applaud, you need only to look at my mother. She has always known how to keep sport and competition in perspective.

From the time that I began playing ball, the first question she would ask me was not, "Did you win?" She never asked how many points I scored. The first question she would always ask me was, "Did you have fun?"

Tonight, I would like to end by answering that question. "Mom, I lived my dream. I had the opportunity to live the greatest life, the life of a collegiate athlete. Yes, I had fun and I have always had fun." Thank you very much. (Applause)

**Mr. Ford:** Kevin, thank you. As Kevin said tonight, we do, in fact, celebrate dreams. I think it is important one last time to congratulate those Top VIII Award winners who are with us this evening for accomplishing their dreams.

I am going to ask all the Top VIII Award winners and their parents in the audience to stand for one moment so that we can recognize the achievement of your own dreams in these children. Please stand for one more round of applause. (Applause)

## **SILVER ANNIVERSARY AWARDS**

**Mr. Ford:** We now turn our attention to this year's Silver Anniversary winners. This award, for those of you who may not be familiar with it, honors six former student-athletes 25 years after their graduation.

Not only did these student-athletes have astonishing athletics careers, as you will see, but they also used that same competitive spirit, that competitive drive to succeed in making their lives enormous successes. They are not only champions in what they did in their various athletics endeavors, but more so in what they have done with their lives and for the lives of others in the 25 years since they left their colleges and universities.

Our first recipient this evening is Alpha Alexander, College of Wooster. (Applause) Alpha was a four-year varsity starter with the Wooster women's basketball team, but her talents did not stop there. This four-sport star also excelled in volleyball, tennis and lacrosse.

Alpha is now an independent consultant who dedicates her career to the advancement of sport. In 1995, she was named one of the 30 most valuable professionals in the business of sports in the United States by Black Enterprise magazine.

**Audiovisual Recording:** Those who think athletics are dominated by "alpha males," meet one of sport's first "alpha females." Alpha Alexander has been taking women's sports to a higher level since her days at Ohio's Wooster College, where she lettered in three

sports, including volleyball and basketball.

But her biggest impact has come off the court, where Dr. Alexander has worked for a quarter century to help women and minorities succeed in athletics. She co-founded the Black Women in Sport Foundation in 1992 and documented the achievements of our greatest black female athletes. As a long-time member of the national YWCA, she has brought the joy of sport to new places and new people.

But Dr. Alexander's efforts haven't stopped at our borders. In recent years, Dr. Alexander has led cultural exchanges around the world — from Russia to Haiti, from Greece to South Africa — spreading the gospel of sport and inclusion. (Applause)

**Mr. Ford:** Receiving her Silver Anniversary Award from Dr. R. Stanton Hales, president, College of Wooster, ladies and gentlemen, Alpha Alexander. (Applause)

Our next honoree is Archie Griffin, Ohio State University. As a running back for Ohio State, Archie became the only player in history to win the Heisman Trophy twice. He remains Ohio State's career rushing leader, his record unmatched in 25 years.

After enjoying an equally successful NFL career, Archie turned his efforts toward professional and civic contributions. Still easily recognized as one of football's greatest, Archie has been inducted into four different athletic hall of fames.

**Audiovisual Recording:** Archie Griffin, the name is synonymous with college football itself. And for four years in the early '70s, Ohio State's Buckeyes might as well have been called "The Archies," as Griffin carried them to Rose Bowl berths every season he suited up.

With his darting moves and his refusal to be corralled, Griffin reeled off an incredible string of 31 straight 100-yard games. He also made a bit of sports history, winning the Heisman Trophy not once, but twice. In 1976, Griffin took his unrelenting ground attack a few miles south as the top draft choice of the NFL's Cincinnati Bengals. He played eight seasons with the club, and his average of 4.1 yards per carry still ranks among the team's all-time best.

But while he worked in Cincinnati, Archie's heart had never left Columbus. In 1985, the pride of the Buckeyes rejoined the Ohio State athletics program as an administrator. Today, he is the school's associate director of athletics and also operates two charitable funds that bear his name. (Applause)

**Mr. Ford:** Receiving his Silver Anniversary Award from Dr. William E. Kirwan, president of Ohio State University, ladies and gentlemen, Archie Griffin. (Applause)

Our next honoree is Steve Raible, Georgia Institute of Technology. As a Georgia Tech Yellow Jacket, Steve was a two-sport star, lettering three years in both football and track and field. His lethal combination of speed and catching ability made him Georgia Tech's top student-athlete in 1976 and later ensured him a spot in the

NFL on the Seattle Seahawks roster. Once off the field he continued to gather awards. He is the pride of my profession, this time in the form of Emmies.

**Audiovisual Recording:** In the mid-'70s, it was a fleet-footed receiver who put the "ramble" in Georgia Tech's "Ramblin' Wreck." On a team known for its bruising ground attack, track star Steve Raible was a dangerous threat via the air. The long, lanky Raible once ran the 100-yard dash in a blistering 9.5 seconds. His speed made him the Tech offense's leading receiver in 1975.

In 1976, Raible joined the expansion Seattle Seahawks, earning a job alongside another rookie wide receiver by the name of Steve Largent. For five years, this one-two punch knocked out more than a few defenders, as Raible demonstrated a knack for being in the right place at the right time.

It was that knack that helped Raible score in his life after football as well. He has become a successful broadcaster, whose reports from around the world, including trouble spots like the Balkans, have earned him five Emmies. He has twice been named Seattle's best anchor, and his charity work has earned him the Big Brothers/Big Sisters outstanding role model award. (Applause)

**Mr. Ford:** Receiving his Silver Anniversary Award from David Braine, director of athletics at Georgia Institute of Technology, ladies and gentlemen, Steve Raible. (Applause)

Our next honoree is Lee Roy Selmon, University of Oklahoma. (Applause)

As a lineman, Lee Roy helped lead Oklahoma to the 1975 Orange Bowl championship. His success on the field also led to the 1975 Vince Lombardi Trophy and Heisman Trophy nomination.

While playing for the Tampa Bay Buccaneers, he was a 1983 finalist for the Byron "Whizzer" White Award given by the NFL for humanitarian service. Away from the field, Lee Roy continues to dedicate his free time to charitable causes in the Florida area.

**Audiovisual Recording:** For Big Eight offenses in the mid-'70s, the only thing worse than one Selmon was three of them. Alongside brothers Tom and Jerry, Lee Roy Selmon was one giant cog in the Oklahoma Sooners' "Big Red Machine," crushing hapless opponents with his rare blend of size and speed.

Selmon's 1975 season has gone down in Sooners' history, as he led Oklahoma to a national championship while leading the nation in tackles and winning the prestigious Outland Trophy. Selmon stepped effortlessly into the NFL, where he spent 11 seasons tormenting quarterbacks with the Tampa Bay Buccaneers.

Selmon helped the so-called "Black and Blue" division live up to its moniker. He was named one of the game's hardest hitters by Sports Magazine. The hall of famer earned six trips to the Pro Bowl and was named the league's top defensive player in 1979, all while holding down a successful banking job on the side. Selmon is still involved in the Tampa community, currently serving as an associate

athletics director at the University of South Florida. (Applause)

**Mr. Ford:** Receiving his Silver Anniversary Award from Joseph Castiglione, director of athletics, University of Oklahoma, ladies and gentlemen, Lee Roy Selmon. (Applause)

Our next Silver Anniversary honoree is Wally Walker, University of Virginia. (Applause)

As the leading scorer for two straight years, Wally led the Virginia basketball team to its first NCAA tournament berth. His No. 41 jersey is one of only six jerseys retired by the school.

After graduation, Wally took on the NBA and led both the Portland Trail Blazers and the Seattle Supersonics to NBA championship titles. Even today, basketball continues to be his profession of choice.

**Audiovisual Recording:** When Wally Walker thinks “W”, he is not thinking of his monogram. Walker has made a career out of winning, starting 25 years ago, when his dead-eye shooting guided the University of Virginia to its first NCAA tournament appearance, and its first Atlantic Coast Conference title.

After Walker scored 21 points to key Virginia’s upset of North Carolina for the ACC crown, Charlottesville, Virginia, was officially transformed into “Wally World.” It wasn’t Walker’s last brush with glory. Just a year later, he helped the Portland Trail Blazers win their first and only NBA title.

Two years after that, he joined the Seattle Supersonics for their own league championship. With his slick shooting and consistent play, Walker became a Sonics fixture, once starting 70 consecutive games for the club. These days, Walker is sitting on the sidelines but is as involved as ever, pursuing the Sonics’ second title as the team’s president and general manager. (Applause)

**Mr. Ford:** Receiving his Silver Anniversary Award from John T. Casteen III, president of the University of Virginia, ladies and gentlemen, Wally Walker. (Applause)

Our next honoree is Steve Largent, University of Tulsa. (Applause)

A two-time national leader in touchdown receptions while at Tulsa, Steve caught an amazing 136 passes for 32 touchdowns. Catching the eye of the NFL, Steve enjoyed a celebrated 14-year NFL career. He was a five-time team MVP and a seven-time Pro Bowl player. With born leadership talent, Steve now leads the people of the great state of Oklahoma. (Applause)

**Audiovisual Recording:** Steve Largent has enjoyed improbable success with a simple approach: never let them see you coming. Largent honed his craft in relative anonymity, playing college football at the University of Tulsa in the small Missouri Valley Conference. There, he raised eyebrows by leading the nation in touchdown catches in back-to-back seasons.

But was he big enough, fast enough, good enough for the pro game? The Seattle Seahawks gambled an eighth-round draft pick

and wound up hitting the jackpot. The undersized and underestimated Largent proved a wizard at outwitting his foes. Dubbed “the master of tomfoolery” by Raiders’ defensive back Lester Hayes, Largent wove indecipherable pass patterns, conceived and executed by pro football’s ultimate possession receiver.

When he retired from the NFL after 14 seasons, he held the league’s career records for receptions, yards and touchdowns. Just a few years later, Largent found himself a new “hill” to climb. Today, he is battling Democrats, not defensive backs, as a Congressman from his home state of Oklahoma. (Applause)

**Mr. Ford:** Receiving his Silver Anniversary Award from Judy MacLeod, athletics director, University of Tulsa, ladies and gentlemen, Steve Largent. (Applause)

Now, ladies and gentlemen, Steve Largent will speak on behalf of the Silver Anniversary Award winners.

**Steve Largent:** Thank you, very much. I just want you all to know that those hairstyles are coming back. (Applause) When Judy MacLeod, our athletics director at the University of Tulsa, called me and said that I was to receive a Silver Anniversary Award, I told her it had to be a mistake because I am not old enough to be a Silver Anniversary Award winner. I guess that is really fuzzy math. (Laughter)

It has been a real honor this weekend to meet Alpha Alexander, Dr. Alexander, this weekend. I have had the pleasure to come across the other award recipients in my life before. Archie and I competed against one another when he was playing with the Bengals. I want to assure you all that the Bengals have not been the same since Archie left.

Lee Roy and I played on the same high-school all- star team after our senior years in high school, and we both were inducted into the professional hall of fame in 1995 together. So we go way back. Wally Walker and I became friends when he was helping the Supersonics win a national championship. We really forged our friendship when we went on a deep sea fishing trip for salmon and Wally turned Supersonic green and puked over the rail. (Laughter)

Finally, Steve Raible and I actually were teammates, as the video mentioned, with the Seattle Seahawks and were roommates when I first came to Seattle. He was actually the first wide receiver who I ever saw play for the Seattle Seahawks.

The first practice when I arrived there, I saw Steve running a slant pattern and the ball ricocheted off his helmet. I thought, “I know I can play for this team.” (Laughter) But on behalf of all the Silver Anniversary Award winners, I want to say thank you. We are humbled, we are honored and we are very grateful for the recognition that the NCAA has bestowed upon us.

We also want to add our congratulations to Secretary Cohen, the recipient of the Teddy Roosevelt Award, one of the great athletes produced by the state of Maine. We also want to congratulate and wish



continued success to all the very deserving Top VIII Award winners in tonight's program.

I want to ask you to indulge me for just a moment. If you have a billfold, a wallet, or a purse with a one-dollar bill in it, pull it out right now. Pull out a dollar bill. I know, it is a scary thing to have a politician ask you for more of your money, but I want to assure you this will not constitute an NCAA infraction.

If you have a dollar bill, or you don't have one, look on the back of the dollar bill with somebody. What I want you to see there is our national seal on the back of the dollar bill. You have the pyramid and the eagle on both sides. We are actually the only nation in the world that has a two- sided, double-sided seal. It was established in 1782.

The pyramid on the back side of the seal symbolizes strength. It is 13 layers that represent the 13 original colonies. It is unfinished at the top symbolizing that America will continue to grow, build and improve as we pursue truth. Above the pyramid, you see the eye of providence within the glory of light symbolizing the spiritual above the material. The model above says "Annuity Coeptis," or "God has favored our undertaking." The other side is the American eagle breasted by the national shield. In one talon are 13 arrows symbolizing the 13 states struggling for independence. In the other talon an olive branch with 13 olives and 13 leaves symbolizing the states' struggle for peace.

Finally, in the eagle's beak is a ribbon that contains our national motto, adopted by Benjamin Franklin, "E Pluribus Unum" — out of many one. This was a term familiar to our founding fathers. It was a monthly publication in England entitled *The Gentlemen's Magazine*. Each year, they bound together all 12 months' editions into one final volume, a 13th volume, and entitled it "E Pluribus Unum."

There are really two arenas in our society today that I think best speak loudest about this principle of E Pluribus Unum, out of many one, the principle of unity. They are the military and athletics. In both, we see and learn that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

The truth is, we all desire to be a part of something that is bigger than ourselves. The Bible teaches that two are better than one and a cord of three strands is not easily broken and one chases a thousand, but two chases ten thousand.

In Washington, this principle of unity is now known as bipartisanship. Our founding fathers would have called it patriotism. In sports, we call it team. The lessons we can learn about unity and about team, I believe, just might be able to heal our nation.

So we, as the Silver Anniversary Award winners, a very young class, I might add, say thank you to the NCAA for the lessons learned about life, about team, about unity, about E Pluribus Unum, out of many one. Thank you. (Applause)

**Mr. Ford:** Steve, thank you. Steve brought up a topic. I must, in the spirit of the full disclosure that our journalism ethics require, tell

you that there was a sub-category of the Silver Anniversary Award this year. You probably wouldn't see it in your program.

It is the sub-category that the award goes to "the recipient whose current hairstyle least resembles that of his college days." (Laughter) I must tell you that within the committee there was such turmoil as we wrestled with Wally Walker, Steve Largent, Steve Raible. And Alpha, I don't mean to leave you out of this, but we all agreed that you looked good in yours. (Laughter)

There was such turmoil in our committee over these three that it made our recent voting adventure in the state of Florida look like nothing but a Victorian tea party. We decided then through the guidance of my friend, Bob, rather than fracture the entire structure of the NCAA with this battle, we would agree to retire the trophy in the hands of these three worthy gentlemen.

## **AWARD OF VALOR**

We move now to our next award presentation. This is a very special one. It is the NCAA Award of Valor. This award may be presented to a coach or an administrator, or to a current or former varsity letter-winner at an NCAA institution.

To give you some idea of the significance and the value of this award, tonight will mark only the seventh time that this award has been bestowed since its inception in 1974. If you look in the dictionary, under the term "valor" you will find this definition: Strength of mind or spirit that enables a person to encounter with firmness; personal bravery.

Well, tonight we honor not one, but three such individuals who fall squarely within that definition; three individuals who in the truest form of the teamwork that Steve Largent just spoke about a few moments ago acted together not just to accomplish some athletic feat but far more importantly to actually save the lives of fellow human beings.

Here is the story. Following a victorious football game, an Appalachian State University van and two team buses made a rather joyous caravan back home. Separated by only a few minutes, the team van led the way. With about seven miles left in the trip, the team members in the buses came upon a very frightening event. There was a fiery traffic accident.

An oncoming car lost control, veered across the center line and crashed into a van. That van was carrying 12 members of the Appalachian State University football support staff. The driver and a student assistant coach were trapped inside that van. Without regard for their personal safety, understanding the flames were now spreading from the car to that van, assistant coaches Rob Best, Shawn Elliott and Stacy Searels entered the van and literally saved the lives of their trapped friends.

The character of the coaches seemed to transfer to the entire team. The Mountaineers finished the 2000 campaign with a 10-4

record, reaching the semifinals of the Division I-AA playoffs for the first time in 13 years.

I would like to ask for a moment that Shawn Elliott, Stacy Searels and Rob Best stand. Hold your applause for a moment, please, because there is something I want to read to you. As we said before, this is an extraordinary act of bravery on their part, an act of bravery that literally saved lives.

But as bravery often does, it not only saved lives, but it dramatically changed lives. Jonathan Taylor was one of the young men pulled from the wreckage and perhaps he says best what is in the hearts of those who are alive because of what these young men did in a letter that he has written to these coaches. I want to read that letter to you.

He writes: "Valor is used to describe an act of bravery or a willingness to help someone in need. In describing the actions of coaches Stacy Searels, Rob Best and Shawn Elliott in the early morning hours of October 1, people would use words such as courageous and heroic.

"For those of us who are so fortunate to work with these men, their actions would be explained as normal or routine. The men you honor tonight were not only heroic for that brief moment, but exemplify heroism every day. To understand what kind of values they have bestowed upon the Appalachian State football program, you must understand that these men jumped in the van. But the members of the team, the young men they influence every day, were waiting in line for their chance to do the same.

"Although I can't recall what happened in the accident, I will always have the comfort of knowing that because of the bravery shown by these men, I can wake up and thank God each morning for letting me be here and thank him for letting them be there.

"I once read that a perfect day is one in which you do something for somebody that can never be repaid. There is nothing that I can say or nothing that I can give that will ever measure up to being given my life back that night, but because of the lessons I have learned from these men and coach Jerry Moore and the other members of the Appalachian State staff, I can only promise that I will try to make this and every day a perfect day.

Sincerely, Jonathan Taylor." (Applause)

So often in this day and age, we tend to mistake notoriety for virtue and tend to mistake mere celebrities for heroism. But make no mistake about it, these three gentlemen are indeed heroes.

Presenting the award is Roachel Laney, athletics director at Appalachian State University. Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in offering our very deep congratulations to the recipients of the NCAA Award of Valor: Appalachian State University football assistant coaches Rob Best, Shawn Elliott and Stacy Searels.

The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.

Now, Rob Best will speak on behalf of the Valor winners. Rob.

**Rob Best:** Mr. Ford, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, on

behalf of Stacy and Shawn, we would like to thank the Honors Committee of the NCAA and the NCAA for this prestigious award. We would also like to express our appreciation to Roachel Laney, the directors of athletics at Appalachian State, Kelby Siler, sports information director, and Geoff Wiswell, football information director for their efforts in reporting the events of that fateful Saturday night to the Honors Committee for its review.

The three of us are here before you tonight grateful and humbled by the recognition. However, we would not be as thankful as we are without the knowledge that due to a lot of prayers and expert medical care, Tony Barnett, assistant trainer, Jonathan Taylor, student-coach; Jacob Stroot, student videographer; Nick Lewis, student videographer; Keenan Moore, student manager; Mason Ringeisen, student manager; Eric Race, student manager; Tim Samsel, student trainer; Josh Chandler, student trainer; Barclay Ballard, student trainer; Anne Smallwood, trainer; and Katy Smith, student trainer; are all on the road to recovery for their injuries sustained in that horrendous accident, with a wide range of injuries from bumps to scratches to critical conditions.

Each of the 13 students has battled back from the physical pain. They are dealing with the mental and psychological trauma that accompanies such an ordeal. We are happy to report that all these courageous and dedicated young people will be back this spring semester pursuing their dreams for the future that they all had prior to the accident.

We also have to commend our players for their actions on that Saturday night. They went from celebrating a tough Southern Conference win in one minute to attending to the physical needs of the injured and reassuring them everything was going to be fine while waiting on rescue personnel.

It was a genuine display of care and concern for their fellow students that left a lasting impression on all present at the accident scene. Coaches and players alike experienced a gamut of emotions and thoughts that Saturday night on a dark winding road in the mountains of western North Carolina.

The most evident throughout to many was we only are assured of the present and no guarantees for the future. So it is paramount to live life to its fullest and cherish each and every moment as we go through this journey called life. Again, Stacy, Shawn and I thank you, and we humbly accept this on behalf of the entire Appalachian State University football family that lived through the experience of September 30, 2000.

I will close with this wish for all here tonight. It is from an old Gaelic toast. "May the road rise to meet you, may the wind always be at your back, and may the good Lord forever hold you and yours in the palm of his hands." We thank you. (Applause)

**Mr. Ford:** You will remember when we first began this evening that I told you that those of you who were here for the first time will

walk away with a better understanding of the true spirit of this event. I think what we have heard through these three gentlemen has certainly proven that to you all. Once again, gentlemen, our thanks and our respect for what you did. (Applause)

### **THEODORE ROOSEVELT AWARD**

**Mr. Ford:** Now, ladies and gentlemen, it is my honor to introduce to you the 34th recipient of the Theodore Roosevelt Award. Beginning with the first award recipient, President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1967, up to and including the 2000 award winner, Roger Staubach, each has shown us that perhaps the best victories in life come after we have left the athletic playing field.

These national figures have shown us that the benefits of the student-athlete experience can indeed last a lifetime and that the successes in athletics can, indeed, spill over into a life and into a career that is greatly enriched as a result of those athletic experiences.

The Teddy Award is presented each year to a prominent national figure who, as a student-athlete, competed in varsity sports and who, after graduation, continued to keep alive the importance and dedication to sports.

Tonight's Teddy recipient has transferred his leadership on the basketball court to become the leader of the most powerful military force in the world. In 1997, President Clinton asked this Republican from Maine to cross party lines and become the administration's United States Secretary of Defense.

I should note again a personal note. In my profession, people tend to often be skeptic, sometimes cynics when they are dealing with people in the political arena. I can tell you through my own experience and that of all that I know, that when they are asked to characterize this gentleman, they will all say, and perhaps this is the highest accolade a journalist can give to anyone, including a politician, that he is a good, honest, fair and decent man.

During his more than 30 years in public office, he never lost an election. He never lost one, and for good reason. He was also a winner in sports. While playing for Division III, Bowdoin College in Brunswick, Maine, he was named the team's captain in 1961 and 1962, evidencing leadership abilities even then.

In both his junior and senior seasons, he led the team in scoring. Even as one of the most powerful figures in the Defense Department, indeed in Washington and indeed in the world, he is known for organizing more than a few pick-up games at the Pentagon. Perhaps there is no greater sense of a true sportsman and a true competitor than you can find in a recent quote of his. "When you get on the court, there is no respect for titles. Once the pin-striped suit comes off, I am fair game."

**Audiovisual Recording:** Before he was one of the President's main men, William Cohen was the man in Maine. A member of the state's 1962 basketball all-star team, "Billy" Cohen was the pride of

the Polar Bears of tiny Bowdoin College. The future Secretary of Defense conducted aerial assaults on the opposition, firing guided missiles from every possible angle, while displaying honorable field generalship as Bowdoin's captain and as its top scorer during his junior and senior years.

Cohen hasn't slowed down since. After college, he took his intensity and leadership out on the campaign trail, connecting with the voters of Maine when he walked 600 miles through the state during his first bid for Congress. The young Republican later introduced himself to the nation during the Watergate hearings, when he put Democratic principles above party affiliation.

Cohen said, "It's been said that an impeachment proceeding will tear this country apart. To say that it would tear this country apart to abide by the Constitution is a proposition that I cannot accept. I think what would tear the country apart would be to turn our backs on the facts and our responsibility to ascertain them."

And when scandal returned 13 years later, Cohen again summoned his independence and idealism. Cohen said, "Democracy demands not only that the rights of the minority be protected but that the rules of the majority be respected. And that's true even if you and I believe the majority is wrong. We have to respect the rule of law until we can change the law itself. Otherwise, the rule of law will be reduced to the law of rule."

Cohen, a cum laude graduate of both college and law school, later recounted the challenge of the Iran-Contra hearings in one of the nine books he has written. But his greatest challenge came in 1997, when he was asked to author the nation's defense policy. Said the President of his new appointee, "He has a creative, intelligent, inquiring mind, which is just what is needed for this team." As a powerful Republican within a Democratic administration, Cohen has built bipartisan consensus on a series of thorny national security issues.

The old Bowdoin floor general has become actively involved in building morale and keeping the service combat ready, while also mending fences with old enemies around the world. And when Cohen hands over the keys to the Pentagon, he will be handing over a new military — one he has helped prepare for the demands of combat and diplomacy in the 21st Century.

**Mr. Ford:** Ladies and gentlemen, I would ask Mr. Charles Wethington to return to the podium to present the 2001 NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award.

**Mr. Wethington:** Thank you, Jack. Bill, it is my honor to present to you the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the NCAA bestows upon an individual. On behalf of the NCAA, I present this award to you for your lifetime achievements in basketball and as a leader in public service. You represent success in athletics and in life, and it is fitting that you receive the NCAA's highest award.

Ladies and gentlemen, United States Secretary of Defense, Bill

Cohen.

(The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)

**Mr. Cohen:** Mr. Wethington, Congressman Largent, I single you out even though I don't have to appear before any committee of yours in the future to say what a fan I have been of you and so many of the other honorees this evening.

The university president, Jeff Ward of Bowdoin, Jack Ford, one person who is missing from all of that film that you saw was my wife, Janet. Thank you for being here. You should be noted for your athleticism on the polo field. Janet and I, during the course of many years, have seen a number of films at various functions we have attended. I must say that watching that film just a moment ago, I could have watched it all evening.

I must say that looking at those photographs, especially the sideburns, I remember what Justice Holmes once said when they unveiled a portrait of him in the Harvard Law Library. He looked up and he said, "It's not me, but I am glad you think so." (Laughter)

I am truly honored and humbled to be here this evening. It was 14 years ago that I received the Silver Anniversary Award from this great institution. It is hard for me to believe that the photograph that was shown before was taken 42 years ago.

I have always had this sort of gothic preoccupation with time and feeling that time has been leaking through my fingers, and to look up at the photographs that I saw in the film a few minutes ago surely reminded me of that.

When I was named to the Silver Anniversary all-star team, I had a few minor ball players who were on the team. The first player they called out was John Havlicek, the second player was Terry Dischinger. The third player was Dave DeBusschere, Billy Packer and then finally me. I said for my acceptance speech, thank God the NCAA still believes in the Affirmative Action Program. (Laughter)

I wasn't sure what I could possibly say to you this evening at this hour. For any after-dinner speaker to stand behind a podium at 10 o'clock in the evening and look out into an audience, that is truly an intimidating thing. I was asking Ced what I might say this evening, how long I should speak. He said, with Janet overhearing him, "Give them five or 10 minutes." And she quickly added, "Something light and not too intellectual." She said, "I have heard you speak so many times before I know you can do it." (Laughter)

I did once give a speech while I was a senator and a woman came up to me and she said, "Oh, Senator Cohen, that was perhaps the finest speech that I had ever heard." I listened to her and I was kind of feeling myself puffing up in sort of narcissistic pride. She said, "It was just superfluous." (Laughter) And I thought it might be a slip of the knife as much as a slip of the tongue. I said, "Thank you, ma'am. As a matter of fact, I was thinking of having it published posthumously." She said, "Oh, wonderful, Senator, the sooner the better." (Laughter) I have always kept that in mind.

Before I launch into too much this evening, I want to extend a special welcome to Merritt and Harriet Henry, who have come here from Portland, Maine, and Jim and Carol Wilcox from Bangor, Maine, two families that have been very strong supporters of mine through the years. Thank you for coming all the way from Maine. (Applause)

I listened to Jack Ford talk about what a wonderful evening this was going to be and to stand and sit among so many heroes in our midst. I thought about my own aspirations back in college. I had two. Being a politician, I had a back-up plan. I wanted to be either a Latin professor or preferably a professional basketball player.

Years later, my Senate colleagues would say I had achieved both of my dreams, that I continued to dribble while speaking a dead language. But believe it or not, even given the size that I am, I still wanted to play professional basketball, but I ran into two separate things.

I ran into a rock called Jungle Jim Luscutoff, and during an exhibition game that he was conducting during a tour of Maine, he persuaded me in a very non-verbal way that I was not ready for prime time. Then I did, in fact, have a chance to play in an exhibition game with the Boston Celtics.

I was a substitute one evening for K. C. Jones in my hometown of Bangor, Maine, where I was the mayor that day, and Don Nelson brought his team to Bangor and was putting on an exhibition game and one of the players was injured that night and couldn't play, so Don Nelson asked me to suit up.

I called home and I talked to my folks and I said, "Bring my sneakers. I am going to play this evening." Nelson gave me his practice jersey, which came down over my elbows. He gave me his practice shorts, which came down over my knees. I had fairly long sideburns, and I was wearing horn-rimmed glasses. I proceeded to play that evening with Satch Sanders and so many of the other Celtics great.

I went out on the court and Satch Sanders threw me a full-length pass that I went up to catch in all my glory, and it carried me right into the stands. After the game, all the people who were there came in the locker room. I was suiting up with the Celtics and this 12- or 13-year-old boy came in.

He started getting all the autographs from the guys. He said, "You guys were fantastic. What was that Woody Allen act out there?" (Laughter) That sort of dashed my hopes forever of thinking I could possibly play basketball again.

When I campaigned for Congress the first time back in 1972, I used to put out my little resume and I would go around to all the schools and talk. One time, I had a young lady who got up in the classroom and she said, "Why do you always mention the fact in your little resume that you played basketball for Bangor High School and Bowdoin College? What is the big deal?" I said, "Perhaps it is not significant, but to me it was everything."



I learned from playing basketball that there were rules that had to be obeyed, there were referees who would call a foul if I violated a rule, and discipline that had to be imposed. I learned the joys of victory and the sorrows of defeat.

Every emotion I would feel during the course of my life I would experience on that basketball court. I learned one time, for example, when Kevin, you talked about your family and dad, I had a father who was a remarkable man, who worked 18 hours, six days a week, who never had a vacation in almost 60 years, and he loved his work. He was a baker. He loved watching me play basketball.

One time he came down to a church league game. I was showing off for him that afternoon, and I happened to score 43 points in that game. I finished the game and I walked over to my father and I said, "Dad, what do you think?" He looked at me with total seriousness and he said, "If you had not missed those two shots you would have had 45."

It was a lesson I have never forgotten, that you must always strive for perfection. Don't ever be satisfied to think that you have done your very best. You can always do better. He felt that way after all of those years, some 65 years of making rye bread and rolls, working with his hands, he was always trying to make the perfect roll. It was a great lesson and a great inspiration for me to take that into politics and into other endeavors as well.

But I wanted you to know tonight that the greatest honor that I have ever achieved certainly was being in the Bangor City Council and Mayor of Bangor, the third largest city in Maine, a population of 38,000. Mr. Mayor, is it still 38,000? Of course not.

I'm proud of being the mayor and going on to be a member of Congress and the United States Senate, but nothing in my lifetime will ever compare with being Secretary of Defense of the United States of America. There is a great relationship between the kind of skills and dedication and sacrifice that everybody who you have paid tribute to this evening has demonstrated.

There are people who preserve freedom for you and I and all of us. We live under the blanket of freedom safe every night because there are men and women who are out there tonight and tomorrow who are sacrificing their very lives so that we can live free.

You would be overwhelmed, you would stand in awe if you had the experience that Janet and I have had for the past four years. I thank President Clinton every chance that I get for his being willing to step across, reach across the party lines for the first time in history to select a high official from a different party to say I want to send a message to the country, to the Congress, to the world that when it comes to national security there is only one policy, there is no party label.

I thank him day in and day out for the opportunity that it has given me to serve in this capacity. Nothing will compare to the experience that we had in going out to Bosnia or to Kosovo or Korea, or

the deserts of Kuwait or Saudi Arabia, or going out on an aircraft carrier and seeing the teams under the leadership of people like Captain Devalore, a young woman who had four letters in school and got her degree, studying law in Germany while she was stationed there and captained a ship, commanded it with 500-odd men and women. She is just one example of a tremendous talent we have and the kind of sacrifice we see day in and day out.

It is a great relationship between the kind of dedication that we see in athletics and the kind of patriotism that is demonstrated every day by our men and women who are serving us. Janet and I had the privilege of going out to the Indy 500. She is from the great city of Indianapolis. She is a Hoosier.

She said, "You have got to go out to the Indy 500." We got invited out there and we were going to kick off that wonderful race. It was the largest audience that I have ever addressed. There were 500,000 people in that audience that day. As I approached the podium, she said, "Remember to keep this very, very short."

But something happened that day that reminded me of how patriotic the American people really are. Before the race started there were two Harrier jets that came over the raceway. The people looked up and they started applauding. Then one jet came back. Those Harriers have the ability to hover. One Harrier made a 360-degree turn over the race track, and the people just exploded with applause.

As I was walking to the podium that afternoon, a number of people came over and said, "That was a sound of freedom and thank God they are ours." That is what we have to remind ourselves day in and day out. There are dedicated people out there. You see them during times of crisis. You saw them during Desert Fox when we flew 38,000 sorties in that campaign. Two planes were lost out of those 38,000 sorties, no pilots.

That tells you something about the excellence and the professionalism and the dedication, the competence that we have in our military. You see it also in the sorrow when you see a hole blown into the side of the USS Cole. Most people saw the hole. They saw the tragedy. But what you didn't see was the people after that hole was blown on that ship. There were all of those people aboard that ship in total darkness. They had no power. They were taking on water, almost three feet a minute pouring in.

They had no means of getting it out. They were bailing it by hand. They were determined to make sure that ship didn't go down. That is the kind of dedication, that is the kind of patriotism that our men and women have day in and day out. They demonstrate that on our behalf.

So what Janet and I have tried to do, we have tried to reconnect America to its military. We have a smaller military than we have ever had in the past. We have an all-volunteer force. It is a less visible presence in your lives. We have a less visible enemy in our lives.

So we want to reconnect the American people to the people who are serving to remind them that we need to have bright people capable, dedicated athletic people to come into our military to serve us. So we take every occasion to remind them, whether we go to the Microsoft campus or drop into the Illinois Legislature or the Chambers of Commerce.

But wherever I can, wherever we go and I have traveled in four years over 800,000 miles, and Janet has been by my side virtually all of that time, and it has been the highlight of our lives. We say that we serve as the civilian leaders of the greatest military in the world, bar none.

Wherever we go, they say we want to be like you. We admire or we envy or we fear, but we want to have a military like you have got in the United States. It is that kind of patriotism and dedication that we see represented by the United States.

We took NFL Fox Sunday — some of you may have seen that show a few weeks ago — out on the USS Harry Truman just off the coast of Italy a couple of weeks ago when we were helping to take a holiday tour to bring a touch of home — Janet is the first lady also of the USO — to all of those troops who are over there, who are missing their families at Christmas time. You can't imagine how poignant it is to see these people who are without their families who want to be home celebrating, out there doing their job and their duty protecting us.

We brought NFL Fox Sunday, and thank goodness they came. They had their own team of Terry, Howie, Chris and J.B., and they went out for two or three days aboard that carrier showing the kind of dedication and talent and competence we see in our military.

We traveled to Ramstadt, to Kosovo, to Bosnia, to bring this message of cheer to our troops. Mike Singletary, the great linebacker of the Chicago Bears, got up and said something that has stayed with us and stayed with all our troops. He said, "When I look out into the faces of these young men and women, I think of that passage in the Bible in the book of Isaiah when God asked who will go for me?" And the answer came back, "I will go for you." And he said, "Thanks to you, people like me, professional football players, and Terry, we are able to go out and be as good as we can be because of you." We should never, ever forget that.

So tonight, I wanted to come to you to say how honored I am to enjoy receiving this award that went to Presidents Eisenhower, Ford, Reagan and Bush, Mr. Bradley, and maybe afford in my future some other political aspiration I can have.

But what I really wanted to say is we need to pay tribute to our military as often as we can. Every time you see somebody in uniform, go up and say, "Thank you, thank you for what you do for us. Because of what you do we can have the athletes performing at high school and college and professional football and basketball and all of the sports because of what you do."

I would like to close with something that was said by Walter Lipmann many years ago back in 1940. It was on the eve of World War II. He was talking to his classmates. It was the 30th reunion of the class of 1910. He looked out to his classmates' faces and he was lecturing them.

He said, "You know, every time we have had a hard choice to make, we took the easy way out. That has been the story of everything that has happened since World War I. Here we are on the edge of war with this mechanized evil that is ravaging through Europe."

He said, "This is the standard to which we must now repair. You took the good things for granted, and now you must earn them again. For every right that you cherish, you have a duty you must perform. For every hope that you entertain, we have an obligation you must perform. For every good that you wish to achieve, you must sacrifice your comfort and your deeds. There is nothing for nothing any longer."

Those words had great meaning on the verge of World War II, but they are a prescription for life as well. Every single athlete who you have paid tribute to this evening, everyone on this podium, all who are in the audience who have participated, everybody understands what it means to say to you that you must sacrifice your comfort and your ease.

You must dedicate yourself to the high ideals and principles that made this the greatest country in the face of the earth, the greatest source and force for freedom. Thank you very much. I am honored.

(The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)

**Mr. Ford:** Mr. Secretary, I suspect that this award is certainly a reflection of the fact if the President indeed did want to send a message through his selection, he chose the right messenger to do so. I also suspect as proud as you are of your father and his accomplishments, he would be as proud of you and your accomplishments, even if you were a few points short of 45 that day. Congratulations from all of us once again. (Applause)

As we are about to wrap up this evening, I am hopeful that those of you who were here for the first time now understand and appreciate what I said about the spirit of this evening. As we have honored this extraordinary array of award recipients this evening, I think it is interesting to note that as different as their backgrounds may be, as different as their athletic accomplishments may be, as very different as their subsequent life experiences and accomplishments may be, they all share certain very compelling characteristics, characteristics that teach us an awful lot not only about their success but about life.

They all share a sense of optimism that has allowed them in their lives to say there is something out there over the horizon that is worth searching for in a way they shared the philosophy of one of our great philosophers, Bruce Springsteen, who said in one of his wonderful songs, "we are all just around the corner to the light of day."

They also share a confidence, a confidence that recognizes that every great achievement of mankind was prefaced by somebody saying, “No, you can’t do that.” What they have been able to do is prove the words of the philosopher who said they can because they think they can.

All of those honored this evening not only can but they have done it because they thought they could. Finally, they all share a sense of courage, not just the physical courage that is so abundant in their lives and in their accomplishments, but more importantly a courage of the heart, a courage of the mind and a courage of the soul.

There has been in this room this evening, ladies and gentlemen, a celebration of brilliance. It is a brilliance that has illuminated our past, it is a brilliance that illuminates our present. You can all leave here this evening being absolutely certain that the brilliance that has radiated from these honorees this evening will continue to illuminate our lives in the future. For that, once again, we congratulate and thank each of our honorees. (Applause)

As we wrap up the evening, I am going to ask President Wethington to return to the podium to conclude the event. I just want to take this moment to once again congratulate these magnificent heroes we honor tonight and to thank the NCAA for allowing me to be a part of what I truly believe is the grandest evening in the universe of intercollegiate athletics. Thank you very much. (Applause)

**Mr. Wethington:** Thank you very much, Jack, for the outstanding job you have done in helping us celebrate our honorees. We appreciate your time with us tonight and for your tireless work as an NCAA Honors Committee member. As a token of our appreciation, the NCAA will make a donation to your alma mater, Yale University, in your name. I think both you and Yale University deserve a round of applause. (Applause)

This has been a special evening. I hope you have been inspired by our special honorees tonight. For your information, this evening’s special will air on ESPN Friday, February 2, at 1 p.m. Eastern time.

I want to again say “thank you” and congratulations to all the award winners for letting us celebrate your accomplishments. I am sure you will enjoy many more victories during your celebrated lifetimes. To bring a close to this special evening, Miss Bola Bamidura will present the benediction.

## **BENEDICTION**

**Ms. Bamidura:** Good evening again. I would like to thank the higher power for gathering everyone here today, to recognize these outstanding athletes for their amazing accomplishments. I ask that each recipient use their shared qualities of selflessness, courage and resilience in future undertakings.

We thank you for your hard work and dedication in your individual athletic careers and may you continue to be an inspiration to all.

**Mr. Wethington:** Thank you all very much. Have a very good evening and a happy new year.



# ■ Division I Forum

## Monday Morning, January 8, 2001

The Division I Forum was called to order at 8:30 a.m., with Management Council Chair Edward “Ted” Leland, director of athletics, Stanford University, presiding.

### OPENING REMARKS

**Mr. Leland:** Gosh, I wish I had this many at my staff meetings. My name is Ted Leland. I am director of athletics at Stanford University and also outgoing chair of the Management Council. I rise this morning to try to coordinate this discussion.

I originally had some trepidation about it, but since this morning, our men’s basketball team is No. 1 in the country, I make as many public appearances as I can. That is a joke. (Laughter) I thought the awards dinner last night was great. It went on for a while, but they really missed one award that I had understood was going to be granted, and that is the most courageous delegate award, which has been awarded to Mike Matthews.

Mike is assistant commissioner of the Pac-10 Conference, but he has combined the NCAA Convention with his honeymoon. (Applause) Mike will probably remember this Convention longer than any of us.

I am excited about these conversations. I apologize for the starting time. Some of the information that was published said we were going to start this morning at 8 o’clock, and other pieces of information said 8:30. So we chose the latter to make sure we had not misled anybody and have them miss the conversations.

I will try to move this along as quickly as I can. We would appreciate it if anyone who speaks at the podium be a registered delegate for the Convention and has a badge. We would like you to identify yourself when you do speak from the podium. We would like you to make sure that you try to keep your comments as concise as possible. Remember the old adage my father told me many times, “There is no such thing as a bad short speech.” We have a lot of people who have opinions on amateurism and want to move through the discussion as quickly as we can.

I think this is a great opportunity for us. This set of amateur proposals has been in all my years in the NCAA probably one of the most misunderstood series of proposals. We have had discussions about this for many, many months. But I think right now is the first time that we have been able to come together with specific proposals in front of us. I think it is important that we talk now about those specific proposals. I think we know it is important.

Dr. Dempsey indicated that amateurism was important to him, so we need to move forward. There’s still more comment from the

membership and action by the Management Council in April, and then by the Board immediately following. So the time is now. Now is the time for discussion and now is the time for enlightenment. I think this morning is our opportunity.

I am going to introduce to you the people to my left, and then Christine Grant is going to give a short presentation of the proposals. I have some questions that I felt that the membership would want to ask that I will pose to the panelists. Then we will open it up for discussion. Again, we will try to be as brief and as succinct as we possibly can.

[Note: The panelists were introduced.]

Christine Grant will start off our discussion. I can say there has been no greater servant to student-athletes in this country than Christine Grant. (Applause)

## **AMATEURISM ISSUES**

**Christine Grant** (University of Iowa): Thank you, Chairman Leland. Good morning. I hope you have received a copy of the booklet on amateurism, which was made available at the time of registration. I thought it would be helpful for all of the proposals and the ideas behind the proposal to be in one publication. The cabinet supported that recommendation.

Since we are working with a very important cause, the NCAA philosophy, it seems wise to have a document that hopefully is thorough, clear and educational. We sincerely hope you will have time to digest the contents. I would strongly encourage you to contact me or anyone on our committee if you have any question or any suggestions or any comments.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the input and feedback you have already given to our committee. Last year by this time, we had made presentations to over 20 different groups. This year, I don't know what the total count is. I can assure you that your input has been totally involved in that.

I am going to take just a few moments to try to explain to you in as simple fashion as I can how we came from where we were three years ago to where we are today. It has been a roller coaster ride for our subcommittee. Three years ago, we realized that we were seeing an increased number of institutions strongly requesting reinstatement of student-athletes who had violated some of the amateurism rules prior to enrollment.

When we investigated this situation, we found that our system was both inconsistent and unfair. The universities wanted our subcommittee to consider two major changes. One change would allow student-athletes to continue to be eligible, that these student-athletes have not gained a competitive advantage. That came across very clearly.

The second thing they wanted change on was to try to find a penalty for student-athletes who had indeed gained a competitive



advantage. For the first year of our existence, we listened. By the end of that first year, we had formulated two full values that we thought would help guide us in the assignment we had been given.

The first core value was to find competitive equity for individual student-athletes, which hopefully in turn would provide competitive excellence for our institutions. The second core value we had was one that was said yesterday, all these things according to the best interest of our prospective student-athletes and our current student-athletes. These were the two values that we began with.

What we asked the committee to do was to do what we have tried to do for the last few decades — investigate what prospective student-athletes have done during the 17 or 18 years prior to their enrollment in the university. There are two problems with that.

One, there are many people who question if the NCAA has the authority to legislate and regulate in the pre-enrollment period. Secondly, almost all people realize that it is not feasible for the organization to do so. Because of these reasons, the subcommittee started thinking about how we could deregulate the pre-enrollment period in areas where student-athletes did not receive a competitive advantage.

In looking at our amateur rules with that in mind, there were a few things that we did quickly to identify items for consideration for deregulation. These items do not make a student-athlete a better athlete. There is no competitive advantage.

With regard to the money, because I know that is an emotional topic, it has been a very emotional topic for our subcommittee. But we have gradually become extraordinarily comfortable with deregulation in this area. Through research, we have found that there is not the opportunity for 99 percent of the prospective student-athletes to make a lot of money. That is just not there. For a few student-athletes who could make money, it is highly unlikely that many of those make more than their expenses.

Finally, our current rules allow student-athletes to repay money and regain amateur status, but we do not consider the competitive advantage that the prospective student-athletes may have received. The more our subcommittee studied this situation, the more we felt this is backwards. Money does not improve a person, but competitive advantage may.

Let me also stress that although we have these proposals, all of the other regulations in the pre-enrollment period will stay in place. We are leaving in place anything pertaining to agents, to boosters, to apparel companies and to promotions of individuals. They are left intact. These are the items that we are proposing.

The committee then tried to tackle the competitive equity problem. We have proposed that if a student-athlete participates in an organized sport through high-school graduation and enrollment, there are two penalties. One, loss of NCAA eligibility, depending on the number of years in the organized sport; and two, a year of resi-

dence upon enrollment at the university.

That residence does two things. One, it helps negate competitive advantage that is gained; and two, it demonstrates a real commitment to academics. That rule is as we originally proposed it. We reached this point about a year and a half ago. We started thinking about handling the post-enrollment period, and in that particular booklet you will see the core values are listed.

The commitment to academics does not rule out a thing and includes the commitment to being a student and a member of the team, commitment to the integrity of the school and the sport, and to the principle of competitive equity.

Our subcommittee had great debate and decided we would be very, very conservative in the post-enrollment period. For that reason, we are proposing only four changes. All other rules and regulations in the post-enrollment period will stay intact.

The four proposals are listed here: Operation Gold — fee for lesson up to \$2,000, the same as all other student-athletes. Payment of disability insurance premium, and that, by the way, we hope will try to diminish the great influence of agents on our current student-athletes.

The last thing, if they qualify for disability insurance and actually purchase it, then student-athletes could be eligible for a loan of up to \$20,000 based on their future potential earnings. These are four proposals that are for post-enrollment.

It was just about six or nine months ago that the subcommittee made a very, very important realization. We had committed at the collegiate level that academics would be our No. 1 priority. It suddenly dawned on us if we could do that for the post-enrollment, why could we not do the same thing for pre-enrollment? And that, I thought, was probably the most exciting moment in what had to be a tremendously exciting three years.

Let me try to explain that. We had two core values in the pre-enrollment period — competitive equity and the welfare of student-athletes. We went back and said there is a very, very important core value — the commitment to academics as a prospective student-athlete's primary goal. Think about it. The commitment to academics for the prospective student-athlete's primary goal.

We then went back to the pre-enrollment period and said if that is true, we should change the organized sport rules and state that if you ever drop out of high school in order to appear in another sport, then you automatically start losing NCAA eligibility, and when you enroll at the university, you will be required to sit out a year of residence.

The result of this thinking is enormously important. We found that we have developed a philosophical framework for the Association for both the pre-enrollment period and for the post-enrollment period that directly ties participation in the sport to education.

That is so significant. Amateurism is tied directly to education, not tied to the draft, not tied to a contract, but the most important thing. Why are we different? Because we have this unique bonding between sports and education.

If that bond is ever broken at any time for organized sports, you pay two penalties — loss of eligibility and a year of residence. I would love to stand up and tell you that three years ago our subcommittee decided this was exactly what we were going to try to do. We were going to try to define amateurism in a different way in order to tie education and the sport directly and in a consistent fashion throughout a young person's life.

We didn't have a clue what we were doing three years ago. It was such an enormous problem that we were trying to tackle, but the important thing is that by the end of our research, study and debate, we have come up with a consistent philosophical framework that makes a lot of sense.

If you turn to Page 2 of this booklet, you will see the current definition of amateurism as it is printed in our NCAA Manual. It is really interesting because this definition has hardly been changed since the founding of the Association. It says: "Student-athletes shall be amateurs in an intercollegiate sport, and their participation should be motivated by education and by the physical, emotional and social benefits to be derived. Student participation in intercollegiate athletics is an avocation, and student-athletes should be protected from exploitation by professional and commercial enterprises."

It is important to note that this definition has been guiding us for almost 100 years. We are not recommending that it be eliminated. We are recommending that it be strengthened. You will also note another thing. This definition doesn't talk about pre-enrollment. It only talks about intercollegiate sport, post-enrollment.

Somehow or another a few decades ago, I don't know exactly when, we stopped regulating in the pre-enrollment period with no guidelines whatsoever in order to make good sound decisions. That is why we have been in problems ever since.

The committees have been studying amateurism, I think, for about 30 years, and that is fine. This definition talks about post-enrollment amateurism. We have dabbled in pre-enrollment amateurism. But our subcommittee has come up with a very positive amendment to define amateurism as a full-time study pursuing an education on an uninterrupted basis.

Let me read that again, because it is so important in defining amateurism as a full-time student pursuing education on an uninterrupted basis. Hopefully, if you adopt that definition, it should be clear that academics come first in pre-enrollment and post-enrollment, and athletics comes second and are pursued as an avocation, which is noted in the original definition.

Let me finish with what I perceive to be the benefits of this approach. One, I think that it will solve the competitive equity prob-

lem that you have been pleading with us to try to solve. Secondly, it will get the NCAA out of regulation in the pre-enrollment period to the extent that it is possible. Three, it will be a much easier system to investigate and to monitor. Four, it will allow failed professionals a second chance at a college education. Five, and this is the most important thing to me, it helps our Association establish a consistent philosophical framework for both the pre- and the post-enrollment periods, which is easier to understand, rational and logical. Thank you. (Applause)

**Mr. Leland:** I will ask a series of questions of our panelists to get them engaged, and then we will open it up to the microphones. The first questions I prepared were adequately answered by Christine, so I will go to the third.

Will deregulation of amateurism change the nature of high-school athletics? Is there anyone who would like to respond to that?

**Doug Woolard** (St. Louis University): I certainly don't claim to be an expert in high-school athletics, but in my previous life I was a high-school athletic director for 12 years. The subcommittee did meet with various high-school associations while developing these proposals.

Although we understand the uncertainty that comes with change, our group ultimately concluded it did not compromise the fact that change needs to be made in our current rules. We understand our rules may not be congruent with each of the 50 high-school associations, and that these high-school associations may need to adopt specific legislation that fits their specific needs.

If this is a student welfare issue and if we are trying to do what is best for the prospective student-athletes, then we need to develop legislation that helps us to do so. During our visits to the high-school associations, they were concerned that our legislation could be detrimental to educationally based initiatives.

As Christine has just spoken to, actually the opposite is true. Our proposed legislation is based on education, not money, as it is now. The proposal actually encourages prospective student-athletes who stay in school so that they can preserve four seasons of collegiate competition after graduation.

They express concern about prospective student-athletes receiving prize money. We don't think that a cross country runner accepting a prize for winning a road race gives him or her a collegiate competitive advantage. If high schools have a concern about compensation in any form, the individual state associations or the national organization should be able to address such concerns in their rules and in their regulations. Accepting money prior to collegiate enrollment should not make the prospective student-athlete ineligible in our programs.

Another concern expressed by the high-school associations was about high-school athletes leaving the high-school setting for "outside competition." Most high schools across the country have programs

that are highly competitive, well run and well supported. In the 12 years that I was a high-school athletic director, it was my experience that the so-called club teams were teams outside the high-school setting. They wanted to become part of the interscholastic environment and not the opposite. The subcommittee believes that concerns about the formation of some sort of super league is based on fear rather than fact.

It appears that there would be very little support for such an environment. We realize that change is often uneasy and our membership experienced that a few years ago when we adopted legislation allowing our student-athletes to work during the academic year. We probably can all recall the consternation many of us had at that time.

The subcommittee feels that these proposals that are in front of you will have a positive impact on the welfare of prospective student-athletes. We are also aware that again the high-school associations may implement rules and regulations that best suit high-school athletes.

If during this process inequities do arise, the membership has in place a subcommittee that has three-plus years of experience on the subject of amateurism. This subcommittee will remain active and will continue to evaluate the impact of this legislation on student-athlete's welfare.

**Mr. Leland:** Thank you. Does amateurism really need to be fixed? Tom

**Tom Hansen** (Pacific-10 Conference): Thank you, Ted. Thanks to everyone for being here this morning to visit with us. I think Christine covered this, but I would paraphrase her by saying that it seems to me that the NCAA is caught in a crossfire between the abandonment of amateurism on a worldwide basis by organizations throughout the world, and the growing aggressiveness of the professional sports organizations in the United States.

We have tried to come up with a way to address this. The fact of the matter is it is virtually impossible for the staff to determine the clarity of the eligibility status of foreign student-athletes and prospective student-athletes. This is an attempt to address that and make it more fair to the American student-athletes who we know a great deal more.

So, yes, we needed it badly. I think that we would have a much better and fairer system for prospective student-athletes. Our members have demonstrated that you agree with that premise because you have continuously been eyeballing and petitioning for restoration and eligibility for foreign student-athletes, particularly ones who have demonstrated that they have professionalized themselves. That volume increases rather than decreases as does the influx of foreign student-athletes.

**Ms. Grant:** Our committee felt that because of your input the system needed to be fixed. We felt that a comprehensive study was necessary in the entire amateurism area and that is what we have

attempted to do.

On Page 4 of the booklet, we put together eight reasons why we should have amateurism deregulation. These eight reasons have been repeatedly given to us by the constituents with whom we have presented our proposals and our analysis of the problems.

**Mr. Leland:** Thank you. What concerns have you heard from coaches groups and how have you responded?

**Ms. Grant:** We have met with many coaches groups and have had very, very good, productive meetings. As soon as we voted for potential proposals, we heard immediately from every group because they feel they had a unique set of circumstances that we ought to look at to see if we could accommodate particular concerns.

We met extensively with various coaches groups, especially ice hockey. We did agree that they had unique circumstances. We sat down and we hashed out how to accommodate them so that it would be acceptable to the coaching associations and also acceptable to the philosophical framework that our committee was trying to deal with.

We did come up with solutions around that. We think they are going to work. That is a very good sport. We met with them and began to work out solutions that are satisfactory to them and the committee. Baseball started out with many, many, many concerns. After extensive meetings, they all boiled down to one concern that our subcommittee then changed for their benefit.

The baseball coaches did not under any circumstances want to recruit in the minor league situation, and so we put that in as an exception. It may be that other sports would like that protection, and certainly our committee would consider that.

We met also with soccer and football coaches. They told us there are no significant concerns with regard to our proposals. We have met on many, many occasions with the National Association of Basketball Coaches. Unfortunately, we have not resolved their concerns, because frankly, we are having a great deal of difficulty understanding explicitly what their concerns are. We just have the perception that they don't like any of the proposals. We can't seem to get a constructive dialogue with that group. I think that these are all the groups that we have met with. But again, I would encourage any coaches association with any concerns whatsoever to approach us.

I think that with our track record, we can show that we listen. We not only listen, we try to do something constructive in order to help our coaches who have legitimate concerns.

**Mr. Woolard:** Delegates, I think the excessive students that Christine speaks to is on Pages 6 and 7 in the booklet.

**Mr. Leland:** I think, Christine, we have a couple of people coming to the microphone. That is gratuitous. Are we changing the entire dynamics of what makes intercollegiate athletics unique and special? Tom.

**Mr. Hansen:** Ted, I don't think we are, because we are not changing who is going to come. We are going to change some of the cir-

cumstances of what happens before they come and recognize the reality of doing so.

Also, I think that it is pretty important for us to remember that today our rules allow a student to play quarterback in the national championship football game after he played professional baseball for five or six years. We allow prospective student-athletes and even student-athletes in some sports to go through professional drafts and come back and play. We are inconsistent in how we apply the rules we have. They do not serve as well, in my opinion, because of that.

**Ms. Grant:** I would just like to reiterate what I said at the beginning, we are not changing that, we are strengthening that. We are strengthening the bonding between education and the sport, and that will continue to make us unique as well.

**Mr. Leland:** Let's open up the mikes now and start asking questions and making comments.

Brian, do you want to say something?

**Brian Dillon** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of the Pacific, California): I am from the Big West Conference and on the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, on whose behalf I will make a statement.

This committee has heard from many student-athletes who represent and overwhelmingly support the efforts of the deregulation package in its entirety. In doing so, we address the clear questions without going into the details. This proposal does address the welfare and will give both student-athletes and potential student-athletes choices they currently do not have.

Clearly, these choices are particularly difficult, especially for a teenager to make. During these times, when student-athletes look for guidance, they do not look to the NCAA. Quite honestly, at 15-years-of-age, you do not want to know about governance, and you don't make the assumption that we will allow ourselves to be taken advantage of.

Give us the freedom to make our own choices. If we fail to make the right choices, then we will move forward and get an education. After all, this is what college is all about. Let us do something based on a playing field.

To assume there are not differences in our student-athletes is pretty crazy. Some are rich, some are poor and some are old and some are young. Operation Gold should not alter the future dramatically.

These proposals are educationally sound and strengthen the student and the student-athlete. Furthermore, it is wrong to penalize student-athletes for something that provides no competitive advantage. For these reasons, we strongly urge you to support these proposals. Thank you.

**Kofi Bawuah** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I am a member of the Division I Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee. On behalf of the subcommittee, I urge you to consider the amateurism proposals before you.

The subcommittee hears numerous appeals from student-athletes and prospects over amateurism violations. These violations include prospective student-athletes prior to enrollment accepting prize money, entering professional drafts or accepting compensation for participation.

Recently, we had a student-athlete, who prior to enrollment, signed a professional contract. We did not restore his eligibility. In many cases, the eligibility of the student-athletes and/or prospects would have been restored and no penalty or no violation would have occurred if these rules had been in place.

I understand your apprehension regarding the proposals. However, on behalf of the subcommittee, I would ask you to take another look at the proposals and consider support.

**Mike McGee** (University of South Carolina, Columbia): I have one question and then a comment. How does the proposal deal with the inevitable contact and employment of agents who are likely now to approach prospective student-athletes?

**Ms. Grant:** As I mentioned before, we are leaving intact the current rules and regulations pertaining to agents, boosters, apparel companies, et cetera. We know we have got a problem with the agents. We know that.

But we have that problem whether or not we deregulate in the amateurism area. This committee is charged with investigating both amateurism and agents. We have tackled the academic problem first. That doesn't mean that we are not going to tackle the agent problem. We are going to try to do it. But I don't anticipate that it is going to be worse because of what we are proposing. Our subcommittee feels pretty strongly about that.

**Mr. McGee:** One of the concerns — and I may just speak to the high-school community since they are here — was that we are dumping the agent problem back onto the high schools. We have, as you have referred to, significant problems in that area. I would suggest that they are not equipped to handle that.

Let me also just tick off several concerns that a number of us have. One is that this will serve to encourage or warn more stop-out years. I would also suggest that this is anti-academic as it relates to progress of our student-athletes. It is likely to create a third-party relationship in college player/coach relationships. As one would suspect, who is involved in that relationship might not have the best academic interest in our student-athletes.

The principle of amateurism is also a principle in the rules governing recruiting that are in Bylaw 2.11. This obviously ties pre-enrollment with our actions as it relates to prospective student-athletes.

One of the tenets is that we shield prospective student-athletes — that is my addition — from undue pressures that may interfere with their scholastic or athletic interests. I think clearly what you are talking about here creates far more problems than we are seeking to



solve. I think that major problems of major magnitude will have the potential of changing our profession as well.

**Mr. Leland:** Christine, in terms of the question of amateurism, if a student-athlete or a prospective student-athlete participated in one of the six types of activities — accepting prize money, signing a contract, et cetera — they would still have eligibility left in our universities. But if they signed with an agent, then they would be ineligible.

Is that correct?

**Ms. Grant:** Absolutely, that is correct.

**Mr. Leland:** Is it likely that people would do that and not have an agent? I think that is a little bit of clarification about what Mike might have been pushing.

**Mr. Hansen:** Ted, I think that is a very good point. It is the committee's opinion that most athletes we are talking about who accept prize money for a road race, or something like that, are not going to have agents.

That is going to be the vast majority of the people affected here. We will have a few, very high-caliber student-athletes who will sign contracts. They are going to get agents. They will never come back and anyone who is going to sign for significant money as a professional will not be coming back to college anyway.

**Jeffrey Orleans:** One of the really attractive arguments for these proposals is on Page 7. It suggests that allowing pre-enrollment acceptance of expenses and some prize money would widen economic opportunity for more prospective student-athletes and provide greater possibilities for a wide range of students.

At the same time, it seems to be the committee's view that there will not be a substantial increase in outside supported activities that will provide this kind of support or funding to students outside the scholastic environment. In other words, there will not be an increase in various employment events.

I am just wondering if the committee has any real data on the extent to which deregulating, especially the prize money and expense part of the pre-enrollment activities, really would widen opportunity to an economically diverse group of people?

It sounds wonderful. My question is whether you really think there are data, and what that data might be, and if they could be made available? I think the argument is stronger if it is clear.

**Lisa Dehon** (NCAA Consultant): I don't know that we have numbers for you, but we can share experiences from some reinstatement cases. In reinstatement cases where a prospective athlete can only regain their eligibility through repayment and they indicate they cannot repay and they cannot afford it, then you know it has an impact.

When you hear a prospect indicate that the only reason they accepted the prize money was simply to travel to the competitions, or to have the coach who they wanted to have coach them, or to get the

facility they needed to go to for this training...

We may not have the overwhelming numbers, but we do have the real-life experiences that let us know that does have an impact. You are right, it is mostly prize money.

**Mr. Orleans:** If I could ask one follow-up to that. In these increases and outside funding activities, have people talked about a number of different sports? Soccer is often a sport that is mentioned where there is a lot more current activity than is realized.

I wonder if the committee has greater concerns about potential increases in these outside nonscholastic kinds of sponsorship arrangements in some particular sports than in others?

**Ms. Grant:** Jeff, we talked about that extensively. The feeling of the subcommittee was that there may not be a substantial number of companies ready to pour money into 14- and 15-year-olds. Frankly, who is going to come to see them, to be honest?

We have a very, very active subcommittee here. We intend to monitor this situation very closely. We can move quickly if we detect a potential problem emerging on the horizon. We did do quite a bit of research, by the way, on the prize money youngsters were able to accept prior to coming to the university. I was actually very surprised at how little we were talking about.

**Mr. Orleans:** Thank you.

**Jim Haney** (National Association of Basketball Coaches): Happy New Year. Back in the fall we sent to every institution a response to the deregulation proposals. I think we did so with the clear recognition there are a lot of very outstanding people on this committee, many of whom I know and I have high regard for.

It was not an easy process because a change in the very nature of amateurism of this Association is so fundamental, I think, as to why this Association was formed. I do think it was done with a lot in that regard thanks to the efforts and energies of the committee. I regret that we could not really see it fitting for men's basketball

Yet, as we looked at it, we certainly saw how it could be very, very beneficial to those who are in tennis or other sports. I think that offsets what was said at the beginning. Ted said at the beginning we will begin sending out our response to the deregulation proposal.

I think fundamentally what I just want to reiterate is that although the money itself does not create a competitive advantage, the way one gets the money does create a competitive advantage. I don't think in our store that one can think that you can play for a year or two years or three years and not have academic responsibilities, not carry an academic load or be accountable for your academics; that all you have to do is practice and play, and you have 24 hours a day to work on your game.

If you don't gain some experience and some advantage, that young person who comes into college does have that responsibility to academics, social adjustment, et cetera. I think that's one of those basic principles we had a real tough time in coming to agreement.

Changing hats, just as a comment, the student basketball council also addressed this issue and they were unanimous in opposition to the proposal. I will just share a little of their insight. They felt that for a player to come back to college after they had taken on the responsibility of the pressures of playing the game of basketball, with the academics and the accountability they have to live under both in terms of financial constraints and academic constraints, for those who have spent time on the bench and may be playing a few minutes, and all of a sudden the opportunity arises where they can play, and to have someone come in who has some professional experience, to them was a real issue.

That person was coming in with a different set of history, different experiences, not having the continuing progress that they had to adhere to be eligible. They just really spoke about those kinds of concerns. So again, we respectfully regard the committee in their recommendations.

We understand how they can be very positive and really help the student-athlete as it relates to other sports, but we really had a problem getting there in the sport of men's basketball. As a result, we tried to take a position that would provide a lot of feedback in this document. Again, we thank you for the time and the opportunity to speak.

**Roy Kramer** (Southeastern Conference): First of all, I would like to speak to the fact that I have a concern coming to the NCAA Convention and bringing up a four-color brochure telling me how to vote on amateurism. I am not sure that is the role of the NCAA.

The NCAA's role is to listen to the membership and move forward on what the membership believes and not be told when we walk in for registration with a very high-powered four-colored brochure what we are supposed to be doing. This is contrary to everything that this organization stands for, and I have a real concern about it.

Second, we have a number of arguments over here. I am not going to address all of them. I could be up here forever. We have been told that we can't monitor the eligibility of foreign student-athletes and, therefore, we should vote for this.

Maybe we ought to be tougher on them and have fewer of them. We will have more opportunities for the American student-athletes to compete in the various sports we have on our campuses. I am not sure that is a valid argument. That is, we get a great number of waivers and not grant the waivers.

Number two, we have been told by opening the door for high-school athletes to be paid that we are not going to change the culture. There is no way that you are not going to change the culture by allowing high-school athletes to receive compensation and become professionals and thereby come under the influence of significant individuals who have absolutely nothing to do with the education and absolutely nothing to do with the welfare of that young person.

I speak strongly because of the enormously strong opposition of

the National High School Federation. I meet with the directors of the various state associations in our nine-state area every year. They are unanimous in opposition to this piece of legislation.

We, as members of the NCAA, constantly complain that the NBA and the NFL will not listen to us, and we stand up here and say we are not going to listen to the athletic high-school association — let them take care of their problem — and yet we turn around and say the same thing about the professionals. That makes no sense whatever.

The idea that we can't regulate pre-enrollment activities is certainly not valid. We regulate the pre-enrollment activities of our student-athletes every day, whether it is ineligibility, whether it is in recruiting, whether it is financial aid, or many other areas.

For somebody to stand up and say that signing a contract will not involve an agent, in most cases in team sports, you are living in a fantasy world, let me tell you that right now. There are agents right now without being paid. If we open it to be paid, we are only granting that opportunity in a much bigger way.

We have been told that we have Division II with the legislation and are such leaders in the world in intercollegiate athletics that we should adopt this. Tell me the last time a Division II athlete was made ineligible for signing a pro contract or had a pro agent?

We live in this world every day. This is why we are in this room and not in that room. We have a different world to regulate, and we better be very careful how we regulate. There are pieces of this legislation that might be worthy of consideration, but a lot of this is a very serious change in the culture of what we are doing and how we regulate intercollegiate athletics, and we need to stop at that point and say we are not going to do it. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Hansen:** Roy, I suggest that we need to change the culture of college athletics very badly.

**Paul Dee** (University of Miami, Florida): For many years, I have been coming to the NCAA Conventions. We have been talking about graduation rates and about graduating our student-athletes. We publish those results. Yet, we are inviting a lot of people to come to our campus who have no prospect of graduating unless we put out additional resources, of which we know we have very little.

Because they come every year or two or three on eligibility, who is going to pay for the last year or two or three of moving toward graduation? Although there is a provision to do so, what is going to pay for that? We hear them say on the one hand to please graduate all these student-athletes, but we are creating a system where it is unlikely that these people will graduate.

The second issue is a year ago I talked about having our baseball coaches go to the minor ball league park. I extended my remarks and talked about people going to satellite tennis tournaments and people going to league basketball events, because to single out baseball is kind of silly.

If we are not going to allow coaches to recruit, they no longer recruit. If we are going to use baseball as the example, then I think you have to go through the entire list and not allow coaches to go to any of these professional events for the same reasons, because you are being inconsistent.

**Ms. Grant:** I want to make a couple of comments. Our committee anticipated a number of these will genuinely be going to organized sports.

We structured the proposal so that the youngster would come to the university, sit out that first year with three years of eligibility remaining, and still graduate in the normal time. That is the thinking of the subcommittee.

We are concerned about the graduation rate. There is a point. If you go out and you recruit somebody who has been in an organized sport for three years, you will have to make a decision before you go out. Are you going to recruit them and then help them financially to graduate? Are you going to recruit them and use them, and then throw them in the garbage? I mean, that is a decision for a university to make.

The second point — baseball. Yes, we made that exception for baseball because we were specifically asked to do so. We would be very willing to listen to any coaches association that wants to prohibit the coaches from recruiting in organized sports at their high schools. We will be very happy to listen to that.

**Mr. White** (University of Arkansas): I want to thank the committee for obviously taking their job very seriously and giving the best effort they could. You have got input from a lot of people.

My background is one of engineering. One of the things I have learned along the way is that as we would go about solving problems, generally the solution to that problem will have unintended consequences. In fact, most recently that was evident not too far from here in Orlando. They were very, very concerned that elderly people would have great difficulty in reading a ballot. So they engaged in consultants. They had a team study it very significantly and decided the best thing they could do was to increase the size of the font so people could read it much easier and create a butterfly ballot.

I am very concerned about the unintended consequences. On the one hand, you think that this is going to help us deal with the issue of international students. I would contend it is going to, in fact, in some sports result in American students having a difficult time to gain scholarships.

You talk about the issue of engaging insurance. I argue that this is going to, in fact, be another unintended consequence. Despite your best efforts, your best thinking on this, I think that you have set off on a slippery slope that is going to be much steeper and much more slippery than you think it is.

I have heard a lot of discussion here today. Interestingly, how the drive behind all of this is our concern for education. Yet, I did not hear

that you had had a meeting with the academic officers, you have heard from the provosts or talked to the registrars. But, in fact, you have been meeting with principally coaches and athletes.

I think that perhaps somewhere along the way you have forgotten about the millions of students who are setting about achieving their education goals. They just happened not to be athletes. I think this is a sad, sad day for collegiate athletics in this country when we are setting off in this direction.

Unless you didn't understand where Commissioner Kramer was coming from in the meeting of the presidents and chancellors in the Southeastern Conference, I think that we are unanimously opposed to this proposal.

**Ms. Grant:** Thank you for the comment. I think every time we have a piece of legislation there is always the potential for unintended consequences. What concerns me is that sometimes I feel like our Association allows a faceless fear of it to deny action that defeats the program.

We have an opportunity, I believe, and the committee believes, to redefine amateurism in a very meaningful way, which from our perspective provides for a stronger educational framework. I do realize that it is enormously difficult to work through this problem emotionally, because I watched our subcommittee struggle with that for a year and a half. I personally struggled with it for the same reasons.

That is why we have attempted in our subcommittee to go out to speak to as many groups as humanly possible in order to engage them in questioning about things that none of us have ever questioned in our lives, and that is what should amateurism be?

I think that is what has been so tremendously exciting about our subcommittee. We forced ourselves to do that emotional trauma, and we believe we have come up with something that may be potentially very worthwhile.

I understand the emotion. I truly do, but I urge you to give it thought because it has the potential to work.

**Josephine Potuto** (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): As I am sure everyone in this room has done, we have in the Big 12 Conference been certainly confronted with these unexamined beliefs at great length over several meetings.

To some extent, we came to a dramatic different conclusion from the committee. Personally, I endorse a great deal of what both Commissioner Kramer and Chancellor White from the University of Arkansas talked about. The staff says there may be disagreement, but there is certainly no evidence that these currently are unexamined.

One can quibble with particular solutions that they have come up with and how effective they are going to be. For example, awarding a year of eligibility, counting participation on a professional team, or there is no 20-hour practice limit, there are no academics infractions, there are no necessary limits on the number of games that will be

played, or at least significantly lower games to be played...

One might question whether this solution is the most appropriate. But beyond that, one of the arguments I hear made is consistent avocation. Well, I am wondering how we can be talking about consistent avocation if we say to a high-school student you can sign a professional contract or you can play with a pro team and then come to a university and be a student-athlete at the university.

You can't sign a contract and you can't take a sabbatical to go play on a pro team. Whatever the ongoing premises are, they appear to me to be the same. The only difference I hear is that we can inform them when they come to our campuses and before they get there give a history of our Association. It doesn't strike me as a particularly persuasive argument.

I am not sure that it will be any easier. I think we will shift where the enforcement goes. If you have got athletes who now sign a pro contract, do they have agents? I think, and this is really what the chancellor said, that the longstanding consequences are out there, and the one thing we know is there will be strong consequences.

I am thinking of the waiver request. I am not sure how persuasive that is. First of all, without what your data are, I suspect that there are not very many waiver requests from athletes playing pro ball for a year who are going to come back to school. In addition, the waiver requests seem to me irrelevant.

If we vote on these proposals, you will be given absolute evidence of what the membership wants. So the major question is fixed only in regard to where these proposals go. I am not sure when you look at the basketball proposal and the issues that we have confronted in high school or junior high basketball some of these proposals are inconsistent with some of the concerns we have over in basketball. It is not clear to me that we will not be in the same place.

The demographics are what you watch today. Certainly, it belies that in football and in women's basketball. There are all kinds of other sports in which we are interested, and if the enforcement contracts mean anything to the extent those youngsters are interested in those sports, it needs to be enforced and followed.

Prize money is limited now because the athletes cannot go to the university if they've taken prize money. If we open that door, who knows what the awards will be in certain of these sports? It seems to me that in a way we are meeting on the periphery of this problem.

The money is out there and we know that with respect to the shoe contracts and with respect to coaches and salaries of coaches. I suspect many, if not most people who have heard, say we need to get a handle on this escalating cost. These proposals are a way, it seems to me, to say that the world we have, let's take a little chunk and move in that direction because it seems unreasonable to limit a student-athlete when we are not limiting campuses and coaches and others who feed on the enterprise.

I actually am not sure the solution is to move what we are doing

with the students into this world and looking more generally. In the Big 12 Conference, we wrestled with a number of these proposals. The NCAA will talk about this and how there are reservations. We can support some of them.

But the proposal that says you can sign a professional contract and then come back to school, it is at this point we are in very strong opposition in our conference to those rules. Thank you.

**Prentice Gautt** (Big 12 Conference): As you know, there are some reasonable parts of this proposal. On behalf of the Big 12 Conference, I would like to encourage you to think about these proposals in that vein. Without destroying the principle of amateurism, let's look at the deregulation package.

The proposals that we talk about, particularly, are 2000-40, 2000-49, 2000-47, 99-107 and 99-110. So there are some pre- and post-enrollment proposals that the Big 12 Conference seems to think are reasonable. These would expand and possibly enhance opportunities and benefits for student-athletes.

The opportunity for prospects to accept in a limited situation these benefits such as educational and living expenses does not reach, the conference does not think, and places in jeopardy the fundamental concept of amateurism. As stated previously by Professor Potuto, there are strong concerns in reference to pay for play.

However, holding that in check, these proposals will simply bring our regulations in line with current practices. We also consider reasonable the post-enrollment proposals that I just mentioned, which provide limited opportunities for student-athletes to earn compensation without participating as a professional. Thank you.

**James Castaneda** (Rice University): I speak as an individual, not representing a group. I have sat through the discussions for the last three years. I would like to commend the committee primarily for being receptive and responsive to concerns that people have had.

I know that the proposal that we have before us today does represent significant modification for its beginning. One concern that I had, and I had it at the beginning, is that we are told that the cornerstones of this legislation has to do with student welfare and with regard to equity. I am certainly for anything that can be shown to enhance the student's welfare.

I had a lingering question as to equity. I can see that Volley Jane playing in a tennis tournament and winning in excess of a \$250 prize does not affect the competitive equity on an individual basis. But I am concerned about the scenario that has to do with the competitive equity at the institutional level.

By your own scenario, there is a possibility that a certain amount of post-high school participation will make a student eligible for only three years of school, another for two years of school, and even perhaps the extreme case of somebody who will have only one year left.

I think when we get to that stage, that is where this hinges upon the academic commitment to graduation. I think that there would be



an obvious competitive inequity, in fact, in favor of these people who have had this enhanced professional experience, thereby diminishing the amount of time they have in the school. This would certainly be afforded only by certain institutions and not by others.

By creating something that we are basing upon competitive equity on an individual level, I think an even greater competitive inequity at the institutional level would evolve. Thank you.

**Ms. Grant:** Jim, are you suggesting a stronger penalty?

**Mr. Castaneda:** I am not suggesting anything. I am simply saying that I do not see as a cornerstone of the proposal an enhanced competitive equity, because I think what has been left out of the equation is the fact that the proposals in themselves could lead to great competitive inequity at the institutional level.

Only certain institutions would be able to afford — unless we simply plan on using, exploiting and dumping them — to take the student with only one or two years of eligibility and helping them ensure that they would graduate.

**Ms. Grant:** Wouldn't you think, Jim, that that would be a very, very unusual case?

**Mr. Castaneda:** I am hearing a lot of "no's" around me. I have to concur.

**Robert Kanaby** (National Federation of State High School Associations): I am executive director of the National Federation of State High School Associations. I want to express our thanks for this opportunity to come and address this group this morning. I'd also like to express our thanks to you, Mr. Chair, for the process by which an affiliated member such as ourself is given the opportunity to share our sentiments relative to the movement in this direction.

Strangely enough, I want to begin by saying there are some things on that list that we do agree with. Some of our members in state associations have recommended taking and looking at some things that perhaps we should revise relative to our definitions of amateurism in our rules and regulations.

There is some common sense to accepting Operation Gold money. That happens frequently at our level. There is also some common sense relative to things like if you play in a game with professional athletes, should that cost you your amateur status?

On those particular fronts, obviously, there is some discussion that we are undertaking. But others listed there on your screen such as play for pay, pay for victory or payment of tuition by interested third parties, we find that destroys the concept of educational activity athletics as we understand it.

It destroys the educational athletics. It changes the principle of our respective memberships that we have jointly held together for almost 100 years by our two organizations. This is not my opinion alone. The things I have just indicated to you — play for pay, pay for victory, tuition payments by interested third parties — are opposed by the 51-member state high school associations.

Every single state association in this country, plus the District of Columbia, have unanimously opposed this part of the proposal. Thirty-one thousand members represented by the National Federation Coaches Association have unanimously opposed this segment of the proposal. Six thousand members represented by a 150-delegate assembly of the National Interscholastic Athletic Administrators Association, the largest group of organized high school athletic directors in the United States, have unanimously opposed this issue. Finally, the 42,000 secondary school principals and middle school principals, represented by a 24-member board of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, has unanimously opposed this proposal.

Six or nine months ago, one of the most exciting relations we were told was a commitment to education. If there was anything that was said for the professional opinion of the groups that I have just mentioned to you, each and every one of those sees these initiatives as being anti-educational in nature.

You can advise us that this does not demand us to enforce our rules. And we will. Each of us has rules against this. We have had them since the inception of our organizations. But the point and the message I wish to give to you is that we cannot do this alone. We need your help.

We need you, we need the student-athletes who need both of us to present to them a seamless philosophy of thought from one level of ours to yours. Some principles cannot be compromised. I would offer to you that you are not deregulating your definition of amateurism.

You believe in these principles. You simply choose not to recognize them at our level. Every single requirement disregarded at the high-school level comes back when a student crosses your threshold. This is, therefore, nothing more than an administrative accommodation, in our judgment.

We urge you to implement internal procedures that allow you to make more students eligible, if that is what you choose to do, but do that without compromising the principles of amateurism. You have also offered that you have no right to impose your interests on the high-school level. Yet later on in this session, your committee on Division I basketball issues will take just the opposite approach. They are going to recommend to you multiple issues to interact at the high-school level. That seems inconsistent to us at best. Why are they doing that? They are doing that because they are tired of being in a non-academic powerless system that is already in place.

This deregulation will strengthen those new non-academic parallel systems and become that unintended consequence of the future. Four years after passage of this type of deregulation, we will have the result of a generation of premier athletes who will expect to be paid when providing their services. They will expect to be paid when they bring victories to your schools. They will be involved with handlers, managers, runners, friends and the interested uncle who surfaces out

of the woodwork, not by contract but under the table, where none of us will be able to ferret that out at the high-school level.

Surely, if someone who signs with an agent and goes through all these things, they are going to lose their eligibility. But that is not what is going to happen. What will happen is somebody will slip somebody a \$100 bill after a summer basketball game, and they are going to get used to that.

You know what they are going to say? They are going to say to that youngster, "Don't worry about it. If you get caught, it is not going to cost you a single year of your athletic eligibility at the NCAA."

Yesterday, President Dempsey talked about changing the culture of the sports in America. If one thinks that the present scenario that I just explained to you is going to assist in changing that simply because the youngster crosses over your threshold after having gone through that as a 15-, 16-, 17-, 18-year-old, then you are looking at more consequences.

I do agree with what Ced Dempsey said about massive educational effort to stand these worst of times that we find ourselves. We agree and we wish to be a part of it and offer our hand in friendship and partnership to make it happen, because it will not be successful if you choose to begin at age 18 or 19. Nor will it be successful if it occurs with 15-, 16- or 17-year olds during the 20-day summer evaluation period.

We need to work together all of the time if we wish to change the culture of sports in this country. Our founding principles must not adjust to society time. Our system for implementing these principles, without compromising intent, is what must change.

That is why we have these founding principles. Yesterday when I spoke to the Division II session, I began by saying I felt a little bit like the captain at the helm of a ship when he turned to go into the last massive wave of the storm. Today, I feel a little bit different. I feel like I am on a deck where the captain has his crew and he said he must make a choice, that we are going to follow one direction or the other. I hope you make the right choice. We stand committed to helping you with that. Thank you.

**Ms. Grant:** The subcommittee is not unsympathetic to the high-school concerns. I would tell you that we debated this extensively. I would say that it is our belief that the worst case scenarios that are feared are unlikely to occur.

We may be wrong, but that is our best judgment. We also extensively talked about whether or not the NCAA should be involved in the regulation of prospective student-athletes in the pre-enrollment period. That is critical. We concluded that we should not be unless it is essential that we do so.

In the area of academics, I know that you don't agree with the subcommittee's assertion that we offer an education in the basic system. But that is our belief and we would hope that you would attempt to see it from our perspective. The associations and the NCAA need

to continue to try to work to resolve our differences.

We see each high-school association as having the authority to make whatever rule they wish to make in order to protect their great programs, and we will support you in any way we can.

**Mike Trangese** (Big East Conference): I would like to be able to speak to the format. I speak on behalf of support for the sport of basketball and remind everyone that this particular sport provides the vast majority of funds that sponsors what it is we do for all of our student-athletes. There are unattended consequences in this proposal as it relates to basketball that we have to pay attention to.

For example, we are going to have a young man who goes through the NBA draft, goes to camp and then decides he wants to come back. I am the coach of the team. What do I do? Do I leave the scholarship open in hopes he will come back and deprive the opportunity for someone else? Do I have the 13th scholarship available? Do we put a coach in the position of perhaps chasing the student-athlete?

We all lived with the problems of running off student-athletes. I know that Chancellor Shaw and the Committee on Basketball Issues is very concerned about the culture. This will be one of the unattended consequences of this.

More importantly, I have the privilege of serving as the chair of the Men's Basketball Committee. I have a great concern for our sport. If there is a problem like that, I think that we can agree that the departure of our student-athletes after one or two years in our institutions is not a healthy thing.

Unfortunately, this Association doesn't have the ability or the legal right to do anything about it. But the NBA and the NBA Players Association does have the ability to do it. I think that over the last 12 months, anyone who has been in contact in the NBA knows that both the NBA and the NBA Players Association is moving closer and closer, in my opinion, to drafting a rule similar to what we have in baseball now, where a young man comes out of high school and would have the opportunity to be either drafted, or they would have to make a commitment to stay for a period of time.

Clearly, if that rule were passed by the NBA and the NBA Players Association, the sport of college basketball from a pure business point of view would be enhanced dramatically. I am not going to be a hypocrite and say we are not supposed to talk about basketball as a business, but it is. We just negotiated a \$6 billion contract, which is going to help so many student-athletes that I am not ashamed to say this is a big business. We have a chance, if the NBA and the NBA Players Association will come together, to craft a rule that will help our sport and our student-athletes in the long run.

I guarantee you that if you adopt this amateurism deregulation proposal as it relates to basketball, the NBA and the NBA Players Association will turn their back on what I just spoke about. I had that opportunity to speak with them. They have no interest in having the young man commit to the process and then return. I am not a propo-

nent of the NBA, but from my point of view, the NBA and the NBA Players Association will adopt the rules I have proposed. Any chance of that coming forward will be defeated by this proposal. I will tell you that is an unattended consequence that is very, very significant. Thank you.

**Jeremy Foley** (University of Florida): I'm a member of the Division I Management Council. For a minute, I had a flashback. I thought when are we going to start raising paddles and using voting machines? That is not the way it works now, as you all know.

I would like to make a comment to my fellow members of the Management Council and the Board of Directors who will ultimately make a decision here, and also to the subcommittee. A lot of the issues that you have discussed and you have worked so hard on over the past few years do make sense for our profession. There is no question about it. But some do not.

As Mike just talked about, it does not work in the sport of men's basketball. You have heard that and heard that. Yet, over the last several years, I see no compromise. I see none going on. This publication that is put out kind of gives me the impression that we are going down the road of an all or nothing type of situation.

Compromise. There is nothing wrong with taking a sport out of it and looking at it a little differently. It does not mean that we need to throw out all this legislation you have worked so hard on. But I don't see any spirit here of that yet from the subcommittee or from the NCAA staff.

Therefore, from a Management Council member and to the Board of Directors, as we look at this, yes, there is some of this stuff that makes so much sense we would be crazy not to do. We also would be crazy to do it, some of the other stuff in this legislation.

For instance, later today you will hear some comments from the Basketball Issues Committee about reducing outside influences in the sport of basketball. How can you limit outside influence in the sport of basketball and then turn around and pass this and allow basketball players to get paid before they become enrolled in college? That is not going to happen.

Therefore, I think it is incumbent upon us not to take the "all or none" mentality. I think that the publication really gives that impression. In all of my years in the NCAA, which are going on 25, I have never seen us put out a publication that is a PR piece for a group of legislation.

Therefore, I think that for the future this is not a bad thing. Amending this is not a bad thing. Not including some sports is not necessarily a bad thing. I hope you will look at it in that way.

**Mark Emmert** (Louisiana State University): I would like to second what Commissioner Kramer and Chancellor White said and also point out one of the proposals I don't see up here is I think one of the original drivers of this whole issue — the problem around waivers and the acceptance of waivers.

At the risk of greatly angering my tennis coach, one solution would be for the NCAA to be much more restrictive in granting waivers around amateur status. We also know this is driven by international students. We also know that part of this is driven by the fact that different sports have greatly different approaches to amateurism and great differences between team sports and individual sports. The proposal strikes me as if we came up with a global solution that doesn't say a lot about the different situations.

If the only driver of the subcommittee's work was the concern about waivers, let's address that question instead of trying to redefine one of the fundamental philosophical principles of amateurism. I completely agree with Commissioner Hansen and others who said we need a shift in the culture in intercollegiate athletics.

This, I am afraid, moves us toward reinforcing some of those elements of the culture that we don't like. It is also as if we are waving a white flag and saying we can't control some of these, so let's lower the shield and, in fact, raise them. This moves us in the wrong direction.

I would much rather see a proposal that says we need to more vigorously enforce some of these stamped rules of amateurism and move in that direction.

**Mr. Leland:** Seeing the line at the microphone and a couple of people who might want to talk, let me do this. We anticipated concluding at 10 o'clock. It is now 10 o'clock. We will continue for a while and let people talk. I think it is a wonderful conversation and both sides are very articulate. Let's continue this conversation and give almost everybody we can a chance to speak.

Anyone who was anticipating being able to leave at 10 o'clock, you won't hurt our feelings. Go ahead and go. You do have a chance to leave now. I anticipate we will continue this discussion for another 10 or 15 minutes, depending on the interest.

**Dylan Malagrino** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Syracuse University): I will keep my comments short. I do have two points.

First, I have a question in order to make sure my opinion is informed. Has any research been done to see how this deregulation will affect the opportunities for student-athletes who come under the definition of amateur and who will not have the opportunity to compete in college?

That is providing opportunities for now what we call the professional. There are not enough spots for everyone. Has any research been done on that?

**Ms. Dehon:** I am not sure I exactly understand your question. Are you talking about international students?

**Ms. Malagrino:** No.

**Mr. Leland:** Assuming that if the student-athletes took advantage of this deregulation, they would professionalize under the old framework, then come back and now be an amateur and play for us. Do we have any data on how many that would be and would that dis-

locate athletes who are already competing? Is that it?

**Ms. Malagrino:** That might possibly compete and not have an opportunity.

**Ms. Dehon:** We don't have any data on that. If we simply go to reinstatement cases, those would only reflect those prospects in an institution and the recruiting process, and the institution that felt they wanted to submit a reinstatement request.

One thing to keep in mind is we seem to be talking about professionalism and we say that word and we use it at the highest level. When you look at the cases, what we are really talking about is the vast majority of prospects competing in a very low level, yet have professionalized themselves in some way.

They would not necessarily be displacing other athletes. They would probably be fairly similar to those athletes. It would not be a significant difference.

**Ms. Malagrino:** That is what I was hoping. My second point is that the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is in strong support of this, especially with respect to what I hope is unique and valuable.

I come from a welfare household and I know that it does affect the student-athlete who in a naive scenario accepts prize money or is offered an opportunity that would technically professionalize him and unfortunately make him unable to attend college because they can't afford it when they have the talent that might enable him to receive financial aid if they were to compete on the collegiate level.

This would provide them the opportunity to have an education. I find it hard for the NCAA to be able to look at them and say, "I am sorry, college is not for you because although you can't afford it, we cannot offer you anything because that would be under the definition of professional."

I would just like to say I didn't like the conversation that was going on and I wanted to make my statement that the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is providing more opportunities to student-athletes, and that is why we are here.

**Mike McGee** (University of South Carolina, Columbia): I have a question for the panel. I may not understand the legislation carefully enough. There is no regulation of income earned through sports participation in the summer months. Is that true?

**Ms. Dehon:** Are you talking about fees for lessons?

**Mr. McGee:** For, instance, playing on a mini-tour or playing as a professional in an event and winning significant prize money.

**Ms. Dehon:** If you are talking about the prize money proposal, there is a limit on the dollar amount of the prize money that is in place.

**Mr. McGee:** What about post-enrollment?

**Ms. Dehon:** If you are talking about post-enrollment, that will be a fee for lessons and there is not a cap on the fee. There is just the mechanism that we have in place in the legislation.

**Mr. McGee:** So theoretically, our tennis players and golfers could

provide professional lessons and make an unlimited amount of money in the summer time?

**Ms. Dehon:** We wouldn't consider them professionalizing themselves. It is a form of employment. It would be regulated by the same thing that we do with employment in the summer right now. It has to be a rate commensurate with the area where the actual work is performed. There is a \$2,000 cap.

**Mr. McGee:** I wanted to be sure I understood that. I have only one comment for the group. If we go down this road, I would suggest that now it becomes incumbent upon ourselves to guard against abuses. The best way I can think to do that is to tie the scholarships that we offer and the numbers that we offer to our enrolled student-athletes so that when an athlete comes, they are fully committed and the institution is fully committed to providing those student-athletes with a degree and that they will be there the whole time.

When they leave early or when there is some institutional penalty that kicks in, that really makes us think twice about bringing students there only to play and not get a degree. I would ask us to go back and consider that type of legislation again. Thank you.

**Betsy Stephenson** (University of California, Los Angeles): I would like to make a comment to the student-athlete's comments regarding student-athlete prospects who come from lower socio-economic situations

The pre-enrollment proposals will allow student-athletes to accept money that might very well not be provided to the players, that might very well help support their family situation. I have a personal concern about drafting student-athletes in the scenario proposed when they would be able to take that type of money and assist in their meals situation, and once enrolled in college they have to pay.

**Mr. McGee:** There was reference made earlier that the football association may support this legislation. Unless they have changed their position at the convention that is going on currently, they are in fact opposed to the second, third, fourth and fifth items on the pre-enrollment deregulation. I think that it is fair to say that opposition among that coaches group is widespread. Thank you.

**Ms. Grant:** Mike, I will just say that I did not understand that is what has been happening with other groups in football.

**Mr. McGee:** This comes directly from their executive director within the last 10 days. Unless there has been communication in that period, their opposition is comparatively clear.

**Ms. Grant:** We will consider that.

**Don DiJulia** (St. Joseph's University): I ask for a point of clarification on the next step. An hour or so ago, I thought I heard the next step would be to take this package to the Management Council and then to the Board of Directors.

Is that the path? Or it is based on perhaps some variety of input today in which there are still many ways that the membership can



define permissive ways for the student-athlete's eligibility in many cases that lack perhaps a package that is in there now. I want to clarify the next step and how firm is that based on what you had said before we started?

**Mr. Leland:** In my understanding of where we are legislatively, these sets of proposals were passed through the Management Council at their meeting in October and passed on to the membership for comment. We are now in the comment period.

I am not sure whether we are strictly in the 60-day period or whether it is just between these. The purpose of the comment period under our new structure is to give all of you and all different types of affiliated organizations a chance to give input to the Management Council members or the Management Council collectively. This conversation today was part of that information and education gathering process.

But these are official pieces of legislation that will be dealt with by the Management Council in April. The Management Council has, I guess, the power to delegate by all of you and by your conferences to either pass or not pass these proposals. Then they will go on to the Board of Directors for ratification or defeat.

I think now is the time. Since there is no one at the microphone, let me close by saying absolutely that was the perfect question to close on. As a long-time member of the Management Council, we do read the letters you send. You send them to David Berst or send them to Ced Dempsey and people do listen.

When we go to the Management Council meetings, we get on each particular piece of legislation a packet of all the letters that you and other people have sent, so we can get a good feeling for what the people's input is.

I think the process in that sense has really worked well. So I am going to close by thanking everyone, especially the panel. I would say one thing. The High School Federation indicated they were sort of thanking me for their appearance.

Of all the years I have been at the NCAA, I think this is the first time we have had a High School Federation representative here and I could say you are welcome as part of our community. Any time you feel strongly about an issue, we want to hear from you because you are our colleagues.

Thanks, everyone. We will recess and reconvene in 15 minutes to discuss basketball. Thank you.

## **BASKETBALL ISSUES FORUM**

**Mr. Leland:** I am pleased now to present our next panel on basketball issues presented by the Basketball Issues Committee. These are standing committees within the men's and women's basketball committees. Members are volunteers who work on our behalf for the betterment of those two sports.

These particular committees have a special status within our

organization for at least the next few years in that the Board of Directors, because of their concerns about issues in men's and women's basketball, and as a follow-up to earlier work done by the Special Committee on Basketball Issues, has asked that these two committees report to the Board their progress on a periodic basis.

All of the legislative proposals that will emanate from this group will be processed in the normal manner through the Management Council for a comment period, back to the Management Council, and then on to the Board. However, I think that the importance of finishing up the work that was done by the Special Committee on Basketball Issues is what makes the Board, I think, more concerned about this issue and this committee than maybe some others.

My job right now is to introduce the head table. The group has a slide presentation that they will walk you through. Then I hope we will have time for questions at the end.

[Note: Committee members were introduced.]

**Mr. Leland:** President Rebecca Stafford of Monmouth University will start off our presentation.

**Rebecca Stafford** (Monmouth University): Good morning, everyone. I do appreciate your staying for this very, very important issues forum. We need to talk about both men's and women's basketball. I have the privilege and the honor of being the chair of the Women's Basketball Subcommittee on the Basketball Issues Committee.

Our job as the Women's Basketball Committee is to try to work through some of the issues of women's basketball and at the same time try to think ahead and learn from the men and try not to have some of the issues that are before them.

One of the first things we did was to meet December 6, 2000. The idea was to establish an agenda and identify priorities for the upcoming year. The first thing we did was review and approve the mission statement of the Division I Basketball Issues Committee. That mission statement is before you now. It will be very hard to disapprove a mission statement that includes excellence, fairness, integrity and a commitment to education. So we unanimously approved that.

We also discussed the report of the men's subcommittee and agreed that while the mission of both committees is similar, there are different references in the key issues facing each subcommittee. We agreed to closely monitor the recommendations of the men's subcommittee as they affect the issues of women's basketball.

At the same time, we developed our own agenda and a preliminary listing of some of the relevant issues that are before you now. Marketing and promotion of the women's game, we thought was an extremely important part of our charge. The quality of the game, the evenness of the competition was also part of our charge.

We were very concerned about student-athlete welfare as it affects young women in basketball. We also were concerned about recruiting and being very vigilant to try to avoid some of the prob-

lems that have plagued men's basketball in terms of recruiting the student-athletes.

Within these focus areas, the subcommittee will discuss a variety of issues. They will include fostering greater parity among women's basketball programs and developing grassroots programs to improve the sport of women's basketball.

We are very concerned about the basketball championship format. We want to increase the television coverage and revenue for the women's games. We, of course, are concerned, as are our men, about summer recruiting. We, too, are interested in amateurism issues. We have some concerns about officiating. We broke into focus groups, and each of the focus groups looked at the larger issues of this agenda.

As you can see, the marketing and promotion focus agreement group is led by Linda Bruno; the quality of the game focus group is led by Patty Viverito; and the student-athlete welfare recruiting group is led by Diane Murphy. These focus groups will meet by conference and by telephone in the months ahead, and we will have another full meeting in April.

At that time, we will hear reports from each of the focus groups and develop some of the issues that we have been concerned with. If you have any questions, I or Donna Noonan, who probably knows more of the details than I do, will be happy to answer them. Thank you very much. (Applause)

**Kenneth Shaw** (Syracuse University): Good morning. It is still morning. The men's subcommittee, which I chair, met twice in the late fall. We met in October and we met in early December. I have to say that I have never seen a committee come together so quickly, act so professionally for the good of the whole and end up with a product of work that is of real value.

With all due respect to the host of this conference, this is no Mickey Mouse group. We have worked hard. The men's subcommittee was faced with a specific and difficult problem on its plate with a sharp timetable in which to find solutions.

The issue is this. Those of us on the subcommittee, and ultimately those of us in the membership, must find an alternative approach to the current summer basketball evaluation structure or there will be no summer basketball evaluation beginning in 2002 and beyond.

As you know, the Division I Board of Directors has already passed legislation that will reduce the limit of the summer evaluation from 24 to 14 days in July, and it will eliminate the process altogether the following year. I am not going to detail the challenges associated with the current evaluation system or how we got there.

What we all know is that there are serious problems with the current structure that must be fixed. Our job today is to lay out the work of the staff and the subcommittee for your review. We want your feedback. We need your ideas, because we need to move this process along.

Ultimately, we are going to need your support for whatever final plan emerges over the next few months. By October of this year, the Board of Directors must make a decision about whether it will restore summer basketball evaluation opportunities. If so, what will the process look like?

It has become crystal clear that there is no magic bullet, there is no single alternative solution that will cut to the heart of the issues and restore the sport to a time when the good work of well-intentioned individuals could be subverted.

As I said in the December press conference, and I will say it again, the sport is simply too popular to regain all of its innocence. There are those who believe the best solution is to do away with summer evaluation. As simple as that solution might sound, it isn't going to be our recommendation. We think for good reason.

Most of us on the subcommittee believe that taking the coach out of the summer will not take basketball out of the summer. We will, therefore, have the effect of abandoning the field to the worst influences that we have heard about already. Here is what the subcommittee is prepared to do.

You are going to hear these words throughout the presentations today. We are proposing a combination of certification, of education, regulation and accommodation to redesign the Division I men's basketball recruiting environment.

I am going to hit the high points of our recommendations. Other subcommittee colleagues will follow me and speak in more detail about various aspects of our recommendations. By certification, we mean that NCAA coaches would not attend the evaluation events that have not been certified. We want those greatly strengthened.

Here are our recommendations. We would require comprehensive financial audits of all summer basketball events, including camps, tournaments and traveling teams. We should be able to see the source of the money and how that money is being spent. We certainly need to keep sports agents away from managing or financially supporting such events.

Further, we need to identify through the certification program an institutional disclosure of those individuals connected to these sports that have fiduciary relationships with NCAA coaches. There is no prohibition here, but we want to bring sunshine to these relationships, and that is another word that you are going to be hearing throughout our presentations. That is something that Commissioner Delany will talk about in a few minutes.

We believe there should be a radius within which a coach can recruit a nonscholastic team member. No longer would our coaches be allowed to evaluate the traveling team from the four corners of the country. That practice is only served to enhance the influence of nonscholastic coaches and make NCAA coaches more beholding to them.

There needs to be greater accountability of individuals involved in summer coaching of certified events. Can they coach? Should they

coach? We will charge the AAU and the high-school organizations to develop strong coaching certification standards for those individuals.

That certification is now the educational component. We need to specify the curriculum for the educational elements at each event. Too often these educational components are window dressing. We need to deliver the goods and we need to do it in a way that connects with young people.

Part of this educational process will include a mentor's program that identifies a lead prospect and gives him a constant who can interact with him and counteract those individuals whose advice will lead him astray.

We also want to look seriously at developing a curriculum-based educational program that may reach as deep as the middle schools. We would offer education about playing sports in an educational environment. We need to instruct about what that means. We need to recognize that there are no cost-free solutions.

Another part of this enhanced monitoring enforcement effort is the role the conference officers and institutional compliance officers can play. We would have literally hundreds of individuals watching the events and the tournament.

What would they be watching for? Violations of recruiting bylaws certainly, but we would also establish rigid restrictions governing coaches' attendance at nonscholastic events to help ensure that this is an evaluation period only.

Specifically, we need to keep the college folks away from prospects and parents and nonscholastic coaches at these events. No more reception lines, no more bumps at the concession stands. We want the evaluation during this period, not to recruit.

We will establish a code of ethics for NCAA coaches and we are asking the NABC to do just that. Even more important, the coaches will have to commit to seeing that the coaches need something. Let me say this, the coaches on this subcommittee are committed to the enforcement efforts for such a code that will call violators into effect.

We have a couple of other regulatory points that should prohibit unofficial visits during the month of July, because July would be for evaluation only. We also looked at the appropriate number of days in July our coaches should be evaluating. It has been 24 days for some time. Next summer it will be 14.

The subcommittee looked at the right number of days from the perspective of the minimum needed. That is the most we can monitor with a stronger enforcement effort, and most importantly what the prospects can handle without wearing out. We arrived at 20 days, no magic bullet there. We think that number vastly meets these standards.

Certification, education, regulation. We also looked at ways in which we can enhance the overall recruiting processes. How do we accommodate group relationships between prospects and NCAA coaches, including secondary and higher education, and between

youth and other developmental basketball and intercollegiate athletics?

We are calling these initiatives a combination. Again, our goal is to minimize nonscholastic influences and increase exposure of prospects and those associated with secondary or higher education. To that end, the subcommittee supported a concept of earlier access to prospects like college coaches but with minimal intrusiveness within their lives.

Specifically, we support contact between the NCAA coaches and prospects in April of the prospect's junior year. The subcommittee also supports the evaluation of basketball events during its newly established contact period in April of the prospect's junior year, but under certain controls.

We support eliminating opportunities at sites, other than the prospect's school during the September contact period. We support the committee's recommendation to place selective toll-free calls to coaches earlier than currently is permitted. These are calls from prospect to coach, not coach to prospect — what these student-athletes have called intrusive.

We think such contacts will strengthen the relationship between prospects and NCAA coaches and diminish the prospect's reliance on outside influence. To strengthen the relation further, coaches could make calls beginning approximately a year earlier than we allow them to do now.

Also, phone calls to junior prospects would be increased but limited to one per month. Written correspondence could begin after the sophomore year. Finally, we support the official visits at the beginning of the new year but without increasing the total number of official visits beyond the current five.

We also want to strengthen the relationship between other developmental groups and intercollegiate athletics. We should encourage other basketball governance bodies — the NCAA, USA Basketball, the AAU, the National Federation of State High School Associations — to compete with the existing camps and tournaments.

Clearly, we can't discriminate among certified events which ones our coaches can attend, but we sure ought to be asking those entities with strong ties to education to compete with quality opportunities against those who don't have such ties.

How do these proposals stack up against our goal to redesign the Division I men's basketball recruiting environment? Again, I said in December that I believe they stack up very well. They are not perfect. If we wait for a perfect solution, we will likely never get anything done.

This probably is not the last time we will have to examine summer evaluation and year-round recruiting. Our history tells us that we will always have to close loopholes. These proposals will not cure everything and they will not last forever. But we are prepared to offer our recommendations in the four areas I just discussed: certification,

education, regulation and accommodation. What do we expect from the camp operators in willingness to comply with the new and improved certification effort, not just in form but in substance?

What do we expect from high-school coaches and the AAU in joining us in keeping a closer eye on who is involved in camps and tournaments under the auspices of your organization? What do we expect from our coaches in our institutions?

We need to make sure there are standards of behavior in place and enforce them. For everyone involved, we expect a willingness to get out into the sunshine. One of the comments we heard during our review of the recruiting process was to follow the money. We are going to try to do that by exposing money sources and money drafts to more sunshine. There is nothing inherently wrong with summer camps and tournaments, but we must insist that they operate under specific conditions, that those running the games are accountable to someone with the interest of young people at heart, and that they are combined with an academic-year recruiting calendar that keeps parents, prospects and educational interests in closer contact.

Jim Delany, the Big Ten Conference commissioner; John Parry, Butler's athletics director; and Ernie Kent, Oregon's basketball coach, are three members of our committee. They are now going to provide some of their perspectives regarding the subcommittee's recommendations. Jim is going to talk about our fiduciary relationships to which I referred to. John will provide some comments from his perspective regarding some of the recommendations. Finally, Ernie will talk to you for a few minutes from the perspective of both the father and the coach.

Once they have concluded, we will be happy to respond to any questions that you might have and any good suggestions that you have. Thank you very much. (Applause)

**James Delany** (Big Ten Conference): Let me comment just a little bit on the regulatory objective here. Most of us are familiar with regulatory schemes that intend to prohibit or modify or curtail certain kinds of conduct. I think it is probably the right way to think about these regulations as intending to disclose sources of information. Specifically, financial information related to pre-collegiate scholastics in the basketball world.

So we are really kind of playing around with the calendar a bit and the advantages from some respects. What I am going to talk a little bit about is trying to use our regulations to better understand the financial relationship that makes the world move, or at least perceive to make the world move in this particular environment.

We would like to bring sunshine to those relationships that are rumored or totally subterranean as opposed to the basketball goals, and there is a rumor of lots of talk and lots of misunderstanding. So our efforts are to make more information available on what is under the table, or on top of the table.

We want to know where the money comes from and where it goes

and have an effective relationship in the process. In short, we want to begin to connect the dots with the corporate dollars that intersect with non-scholastic competition in the Division I recruiting process. By disclosing or putting the cards on the table, it is our goal to achieve four kinds of disclosure outcomes. One, we want to identify the movement of money, generally corporate dollars. There are no television dollars in men's basketball.

There are really no gate receipts, but there are corporate and sponsorship dollars, that move to collegiate coaches, to the Division I athletics departments, to nonscholastic players in some documented cases and nonscholastic and scholastic coaches, to team travel, and to not-for-profit foundations, which are known to pay the cost of private school education with respect to prospective student-athletes. We don't want to prohibit any of this, but we want to know where the money comes from and who it goes to and how it might affect relationships.

The second kind of disclosure we want to talk about is payments by our universities' summer camps. It has been rumored that nonscholastic and scholastic coaches often receive lecture fees that are above and beyond what is appropriate and that they represent or have a capacity to influence where a prospect may go to school. We want to get that information out in the public.

The other thing we would like to do is to get the disclosure of the relationships that exist between our coaches and individuals who they have a fiduciary relationship with. It could be a banker, it could be a doctor, it could be a money manager, where these individuals are tied to travel teams because they are sponsoring them, they are coaching them, they are financing them or they are counseling them.

There is no question that there are coaches who are employed by our institutions who have very close relationship with individuals who have a stake in the nonscholastic basketball and influence the recruitment process. We again are not going to prohibit those relationships. We would like to know where they are and get that out on the table.

The other thing we would like to do is establish a certification process. Certification applies to our coaches. They cannot evaluate players in a noncertified camp situation. Where the camp refuses to provide the information, our coaches will just not be there. We think that we have an appropriate rationale for asking that the camp be conducted in a way that is up front and honest.

So where the camp refuses or provides erroneous information, that camp cannot be certified and not be available for evaluation purposes. What about institutional disclosures? Some of the institutions have confidential relationships with corporations, and they are unwilling to provide information or unable by contract to provide information. I think that is going to be a difficult question for the NCAA.

I don't know how we can ask others to provide sunshine on their



situation so that we can unclog the potential interests of any potential conflict of interest and not have the same thing for our institutions. I don't know whether that means that the institution would be unable to have its coaches involved in the summer process. I don't know how that would play out. I do think that what is good for the goose is good for the gander, and whether they get sunshine on this information, it needs to be a two-way street.

What about corporate disclosure? This area has been generally unregulated heretofore and operating without any guidance, without any rules. They have indicated that once there were rules and once there were guidelines they want to be good corporate citizens. So now we have some objectives.

We have identified the problem. We are following the money and we ought to respectfully ask the involved corporations to disclose and to refocus their promotions and sponsorship activities in ways that are consistent with not only higher education but scholastic programs.

And again, they have a right to pursue reasonable business ends. Like the United States Olympic Committee and the Salt Lake Organizing Committee, everybody is concerned about their reputation to do things the right way.

I am sure those corporations want to do things the right way. So if we ask camps and travel teams and institutions, I think we have the right to ask corporations that are involved in business to do things in a way that is transparent.

If these problems continue and we are able to get the information on the table, we will have to just draw our own inferences. In many cases, all we can do is to get the information on the table and draw inferences. Everybody wants to maintain the reputation of doing the right thing.

We can't regulate bad conduct out of the system, but by getting more information in the way that you can analyze and whatnot in a public way, we can be more timely and more responsible. Thank you.

**John Parry** (Butler University): Good morning. I would like to make a couple of comments about the process and then some observations about where we are. The first thing we should understand is that the national office said that David Berst and Steve Mallonee spent several months doing exhaustive interviews with all these stakeholders.

By that, I mean the players, the coaches, the shoe companies, the high-school associations as well as the NBA. We received the information back and have a count of all the data from those interviews. In addition, we have been able to establish a good relationship with Jim Haney and the NABC as well as the student basketball congress. So we were able to get feedback between our first meeting and our second meeting to give us some sense of whether we were on the right course.

When I first arrived, I was hopeful that we would find a way to

retain summer evaluation. At one time, I asked a Butler coach, "Why do we have to go to New Jersey, California, Orlando to find players when, in fact, our roster reflected the surrounding three or four states? Why are we spending all this money to travel all over the country?"

Of course, he informed me the players from our surrounding states were traveling to all those places and gave us an opportunity to evaluate players in multiple weeks because of very strong competition. That was the most efficient way to determine who the best players were.

So we were out evaluating players. We were not trying to recruit them, but clearly finding out probably who was player number 101 through 1,000. Most of the problems we continued to hear about surround the top 100 players.

Is there a way to develop a model for recruiting that will have enough differences to address all of our concerns? I was very encouraged from the discussion and very encouraged with the results. I believe we have an obligation to be in the fray rather than on the sidelines.

There was a fairly quick consensus that we wanted to play an active role, and we examined different models. I think what we are seeing today is a very educationally oriented approach to providing everything from mentoring to earlier access to student-athletes at a minimal cost.

It is a very modest increase. There is no change in the visit cost; it is a modest increase in phone use. It is also consistent with a number of institutions, including my own, that are contacting prospective students at an earlier and earlier age.

I am sure every private school that is driven by enrollment concerns has to begin to look at recruiting students at an earlier age. I think to pull their coaches away from that recruitment gets us involved too late. I am encouraged by opportunities of getting involved sooner.

In summary, I think this approach, to quote Teddy Roosevelt accurately, "puts us in the fray rather than the sidelines." I am encouraged by that and I look forward to the results.

**Ernie Kent** (University of Oregon): I first want to say what an honor it was to work on this committee. I was very impressed with the work ethic and the speed of Chancellor Shaw, who moved us along. As I talk to you, I want to talk to you as a parent.

I have two boys who are going through the recruiting process and talking to the coach. I am sure a lot of you are aware of the fallacies that we have in our first look. Many of you may not know I had the opportunity to spend seven years in Saudi Arabia. I left in 1980 when the John Travolta disco craze was popular. When I came back in 1987, it was rap music, backpacks, earrings and tattoos. It was a shock to my system where our society had gone to.

As I watched the bowl championships last week, there were two

individuals who had tongue rings on national TV. It shocked me. Maybe they got a two-for-one deal. I don't know. I was amazed we had deteriorated that far.

As a coach, I travel around this country. I made my livelihood sitting in on camps, going in and out of different homes, different cultures and different environments. I have sat at these camps. We do need to clean up the environments that these young people are in. We do need better people associated with these young people. We do need to have some sort of control within the NCAA.

I say that because these same young people who I see in these camps are misguided. They are leading what I would call a falsehood in terms of where they are in their lives. These people with the backpacks, the earrings, the baggy pants and the tongue rings are the same individuals who one day will be representing our programs, our conferences, our institutions and our states.

We have a wonderful opportunity in having all of those young people in an environment where we can teach, we can educate, we can bring them forward to better prepare them when they get to our institution and get to our programs. I think we would be foolish if we waste that opportunity to educate them.

I also know it is a common thread that I see in the homes I go into. The kids are going to continue to play throughout the summer regardless of what we do. I also see that 90 percent of them think that one day they are going to play in the NBA.

More importantly, when we inherit these kids into our programs, not only do we inherit a great student-athlete, we also inherit their backgrounds. Some of them are coming from backgrounds with a lack of parenting. There are addicted dependencies in the home and generation gaps to deal with.

In my program when we incorporate the self-improvement program, I try to get into the lives and minds of young people. You may call me a coach, but the reality of it is I am a parent, I am a coach, I am a counselor, I am a social worker and I am a psychiatrist, and I wear a multitude of hats when I bring these young people into my environment.

What I see is fear, I see anxiety, I see a false sense of reality. A greater amount of my time is spent trying to bring these young people forward to make them successful. As a parent and a father of two boys, I may see this from a different view than a lot of you in this room.

My wife and I feel we have done an outstanding job of trying to raise them the right way. Yet, I see my two sons caught up in the hype of the recruiting process as well. "Dad, we need to travel, we need to be seen. I want the competition. I need to be out there."

The conclusion we have come to as parents is that I want them out there, but I want them in the right environment. I want them to be with good people. I want them in good programs. I want good summer coaches involved with them so that those same values we have

instilled in their lives will continue throughout the summer when they are influenced by so many people who are going to have a very positive or negative impact in their lives.

I also realize that if we try to clean up some of the recruiting and strengthen the programs, there is no way we are going to totally eliminate all of the bad elements that are out there. I think with some of these proposals, we can certainly limit the influence of these bad elements on our young people.

As a parent, I want my two boys to experience the summer recruiting process. I want them to understand the responsibility, the accountability that goes into making that decision. I want them to be in a very healthy environment and have the opportunity to do that.

That is why part of the model that I was really happy to see that we are going to strengthen is certification. We can bring young people together during the summer and educate them. We can bring back former college student-athletes and former pro players into that environment. We can let those young people know the realities of college athletics.

Here is what you are really going to be facing. Here is the reality of your opportunity making it to the NBA level. It is an excellent, excellent opportunity to educate. We need to take advantage of that.

I also love the sunshine theory. I think the more information we can provide on where money is coming from, it will help eliminate some of the bad or negative influences that are out there. I also want my boys to know who they are going to play for.

I was very encouraged by the early access opportunities. With the earlier access, I get an opportunity to know a young man a lot better, and he gets an opportunity to know me a lot better. Please realize that if we eliminate summer recruiting, you will take the power away from all of us and you will give the power to those people out there who we are trying to clean it up from the beginning.

I think this model will give good people an opportunity to strengthen themselves even more so. I think it will give an opportunity to bring more good people into the loop. I only hope and pray that we are strengthening the character of these young people and strengthening the directions they are headed in their lives so that by the time they step foot on our campuses and institutions to represent us, we have got a better person. We have got a person who has his values in order, his priorities in order, and he can represent all of us the right way. Thank you. (Applause)

**Mr. Leland:** Thank you. I am going to introduce the two people — Donna Noonan and Steve Mallonee. They are staff liaisons to the Men's and Women's Basketball Committee.

We had a little thought here. We have 130 committees and 1,200 individuals who serve on an annual basis as volunteers. If the quality of work is going on in the other 128 committees that has been reflected in these two committees, I think we are in good hands. This is extraordinary work on these people's part.

Let me open it up for questions now. I will try to be the referee. Would anybody like to approach? We will direct any questions that you might have to any of the individuals.

**Michael McGee** (University of South Carolina, Columbia): As one of the members of the Recruiting Subcommittee on the previous working group, I want to commend the committee on the comprehensive proposals put forward. I think they will help a great deal in limiting some of the problems that we have all observed.

We have three coaches and 14 days in the current legislation, which obviously gives us ample opportunities to be out there. In our view, after a certain period of summer travel, it becomes more or less a beauty contest. You are out there and you are seen.

Why is there a need to go beyond the current 14-day limitation back to what would amount to 60 recruiting days for evaluation? In light of the additional junior recruiting that you are calling for and presuming that passes, why don't we continue with 14 days for a year or two to consider whether that is appropriate?

**Mr. Shaw:** Thanks, Mike. The group should know the hard work that Mike and his subcommittee put in on the original issues in the committee. Many of the good ideas that came from our work started from Mike's committee.

When we looked at the number of days for the summer, we decided that the number of days was far less important than it was to have this out in the sunshine and for us to have a set of regulatory devices when the right things were happening. We could have easily settled on probably something other than 20 days, which is what our recommendation for the summer is.

But we listened to the student-athletes, who told us that 24 was fine with them. We thought that seemed to be a little much. We listened to other people who wanted to cut it short. Basically, we said to ourselves, can we reasonably be able to provide oversight in this? What is the amount of time that coaches need and what is an amount of time that players can participate without becoming overly fatigued? It could have been 20, it could have been 22, it could have been 18. But once we got to that point we felt that that was probably less of an issue than it is under the present circumstances.

**Jeremy Foley** (University of Florida): I am curious and would like to ask a question of Chancellor Shaw or Jim. You talk about amateurism and your concern about the influences in the summer. Jim, you talked about the fiduciary relationships.

Are you concerned, having studied the initiatives as thoroughly as you have, about a limit if we totally open it up for teams to play and get paid to come to the camp? That falls into some of our concerns.

Would it concern you that that environment existed in terms of no limit on what a high-school athlete or a high-school AAU team could get paid for the tournament being set up and get paid X number of dollars? Does that concern you as you deal with the income

situation?

**James Delany** (Big Ten Conference): Under our present rules, I think that some of what is going on today is in violation of our present amateurism rule. I wouldn't want anyone necessarily to interpret a recommendation here as being for or against the recommendations that are coming out of the amateurism study.

It is true that the model, which I think has grown in dependency in the sport of basketball nationwide in popularity, is the ability to grow corporate dollars. The deregulated environment would be more hospitable to a club environment.

I don't know what would happen in the individual sports of tennis and golf. Those sports have their own culture, and basketball has its own culture. We didn't spend a lot of time thinking about the interface of our recommendations with what might be the unintended consequences coming out of the amateurism study.

I do think that the club environment is an environment that is better than a deregulated environment or a regulated environment.

**Mr. Shaw:** Just to add to that, we didn't really discuss how our recommendations might play against the amateurism proposals. But I would have to say as an individual member I would be very concerned.

**Roy Kramer** (Southeastern Athletic Conference): I have perhaps witnessed the greatest dichotomy in the history of man this morning. We had a 3½-hour forum where we were told that we should deregulate the world.

We now have a second forum — fortunately, we have not been here for an hour and a half — where we are being told that we now need to regulate and educate the student-athlete from the time shortly after they leave until they arrive on our campus.

Furthermore, we are going to regulate the corporate identities that are involved in these operations as well as the nonscholastic athletics programs and the nonscholastic coaches who have no ties to any regulatory agency whatsoever, so we will take them over in the NCAA.

We are going to follow the money by the sunshine rule. We have a sunshine rule now. The coach has to report his income. Is that a corporate involvement with other coaches and without athletic programs? Far from it. We are going to restrict where participants in nonscholastic programs live. I would like to be in that important session when that occurs. We are going to tell them how to play that game. Then are we going to rule those individuals ineligible for other control that we offer to that individual if he doesn't play within his own state?

We are going to pre-pick 100 student-athletes to participate in this program. That would be a great committee. That will be funded and influenced with no outside sources as to who winds up on that group of individuals. We are going to move our coaches out of the Holiday Inn and allow them to stand on the street corner outside of

the Hyatt across the street so they can be seen at the summer camps.

We are going to further invade the high schools by permitting our coaches to go in there the previous year, during the junior year. We are going to send the student-athlete more information so now they have three boxes in the attic instead of one.

Have you looked at the box of information we send to the student-athletes? I have seen it. I have not seen any educational information there at all. We send them 10 more brochures, we create more information, and we now use the e-mail to tell them about our schools.

We don't educate them with regard to the issues we are talking about here. I see no trend to change that. The earlier visits will simply cause more problems in administering the National Letter of Intent. The greater problem we have is the earlier signing period in basketball right now, because more student-athletes change their mind after coaches move, after coaches change, after situations change than any other issue we have in the National Letter of Intent. Now, we are going to permit early visits in the previous year and allow student-athletes to have official visits so they can commit earlier so that we can add to the list of individuals who want to change their minds once they get there.

I sat in a room similar to this with a lot more people in the days of the old Conventions when we proposed legislation to eliminate one assistant coach in basketball. We sat there in that room and were told by the coaches association that we couldn't live with that. So in our great forward vision, we created a regulated category of coaches, which several million dollars later in attorneys' fees and \$56 million out of our pockets, we found out was not such a good idea. We are sitting in this room today being told because the coaches want to stay in summer recruiting we ought to regulate the world. Not regulate just student-athletes on our campuses, we are going to regulate the world in order to accomplish this, including corporate entities and everybody else outside the door.

I want to commend our presidents' Management Council. They had the courage last spring to stand up and take a stand. They limited the way we could recruit student-athletes in numbers. They took a stand that is a very defensible, sound stand to get us out of a subterranean world that had been quoted here this morning by non-recruiting in the summer.

I would hope that we have enough guts to maintain that rather than cave in to a system of regulation which cannot and will not work. Thank you.

**Mr. Shaw:** I think this probably is one I would want to have any of the members of the panel to comment on. I will just make two comments. Roy mentioned that there seemed to be incompatibility between the two presentations.

I remind you once again what a great philosopher said, "Consistency is the hobgoblin in the small minds." But let me make a comment about the sunshine, because I wasn't aware that the pres-

ent information allows us to know what all coaches make and what the institutions make from their various relationships with corporate interests.

I know that certain people know, but I don't know that that is a matter of public information. When we talk about making sure that there is sunshine, we are talking about not just athletic directors and commissioners knowing what coaches made, but it would be out there so we can really have a chance to assess what we will have here.

Let me let some of the other folks make comments if they wish to.

**Mr. Delany:** I think that the term "regulation," as I mentioned earlier, is prohibit or model by conduct. You can't do this and you can't do this, you can't do this. There is another form of regulation that tends to affect people's conduct, which is not eliminating or defining what we particularly do. That is when people don't want you to know what they are doing, they keep things private.

Conspiracies are difficult to uncover. So what we are saying is if you want our coaches out of your camps we would like to have certain kinds of information about the teams that play that. If you are going to have high school coaches and nonscholastic coaches in your camps, we would like to know what you are paying them.

If your coaches have special business relationships with individuals, we would like to know that they exist. We would also like to ask corporate entities that are involved in this area in turn to be straightforward about the relationships where the money goes.

So we really are not regulating in the traditional sense. There is an expansion window for recruitment that you can agree or disagree with. Different people will come up with different results. But all we are saying is that our coaches are going to be out and about in the summer.

We have the right to ask that those camps be up front about how the teams are financed, about where the money comes from and where we are going to be at the institutional level. That is really not a regulation in the traditional sense. It is allowing us to have access to all the financial information and to understand the intersection between the institution, the individual and the team.

**Mr. Kent:** I believe the system is not perfect and I don't think you can get a perfect system. It will be a system that always needs to be improved as we go through it maybe in the next couple of years.

This year alone, of the top 150 basketball players, I think over 80 percent of them committed early without going on an official visit. They went on their own on unofficial visits and made their decision before the early signing period came into play. So you are looking at a system where kids want to get this done earlier. They are making the decisions now, anyhow, and you are not going to change a great deal. If you do away with summer recruiting, you will probably put ourselves in one of the biggest messes we have ever been involved in.

Granted, we have to be careful now with some of the things we have brought up to make sure we are not dealing with lawsuits.



Doing away with it and taking it out of the environment, I live in this environment every day of the summer. When you see through my eyes what I see, the negative people who have more power over these young people than the institutions and the coaches, it is sad where it is headed right now. Granted again, it may not be perfect with what we are talking about, but you can't do away with it. If you do away with it, we are in big trouble.

**Mr. Parry:** Just briefly, there is no proposal to change the signing date. That early signing date will still be November of the senior year and not the junior year. There is a proposal to allow junior visits.

The reason for that is the belief that with the top players where those visits are happening "unofficially," there is an outside influence paying for it. The question is why not allow the school to pay for it? It will not change the signing date and will not change the problems we have if the coach leaves, but will only kick in after the senior year.

**Jeffrey Orleans** (The Ivy League): But with all due respect, it does seem to me if your committee is coming forth with a set of recommendations, and amateurism is going to come forth with a set of recommendations, and you have great concerns about how those amateurism recommendations would affect the viability of your recommendations, the Management Council and the Board of Directors needs to have from your committees jointly some sense of how we can reconcile these when we vote.

We can't have two sets of stuff coming on separate tracks without having some sense that the two of you have sat together and tried to figure out how they can be made to work. Now, I hope that the students will have a chance to do that, but not before the comment period ends so we can see it in writing, certainly, when the final legislation comes to you in April.

**Mr. Shaw:** That is a fair request. We can't ignore the other recommendations, and we have an obligation to state our views separately.

**Mr. Leland:** Jeff, Steve Mallonee told me it is already on the agenda for a future meeting, and that your concerns have been anticipated a little.

**Michael Adams** (University of Georgia): Two quick comments. It seems to me that if you look at the recent release, and I will not use the numbers, of the graduation rates in basketball in Division I-A, we would be better off this morning talking about summer school for basketball players nationwide than what we are talking about.

I am amazed that we have sat here for an hour and no education. I don't think that we have helped anybody. I am concerned we need to look at the same sort of early entry program and the same sort of summer academic opportunities for Division I-A basketball players.

We need to be talking about that a great deal more than the summer recruiting process. I think that we have backed off considerably from where this group started six months ago. At least for one president, I am troubled by it.

Secondly, I won't make Commissioner Kramer's speech again, but I endorse it. I think the proposal about all of the shoe companies and other corporate entities participating in sunshine is about as naive as I have ever heard. This group of people, about which much has been written and about which many have spoken, to think that voluntarily they are going to let us track with corporate processes, I think is amazingly naive. Furthermore, to think that we can regulate that process, I believe sets us up for one of the biggest antitrust suits in history. I was wondering if the committee has had any legal staff examine that particular proposal.

**Mr. Shaw:** Thank you, Mike. First of all, regarding the regulations, as has been stated by Jim Delany and several of us, there are really very few regulations here as much as there are expectations that the information be made public.

I am a little bit more optimistic that we will get the cooperation from the shoe companies and others, because I am not sure they like the present situation any more than we do. But let's take a worst-case scenario for a moment. We do know what our athletic interests receive from shoe companies. We do know what our coaches receive. We do know what the AAU teams that come into play receive for coming into play, and when we hire speakers and the like. There is a great deal of this that we can let the sunshine in, and there are no legal implications to that. We don't think that we have the kind of regulatory package, and we have discussed this with legal counsel, that is going to cause any kind of antitrust questions.

Regarding the first observation, I need to remind the group that the initial committee, the Issues Committee, showed a great deal of concern about the academic environment for students. This is why, as Mike has indicated, it would be a good idea recommending that it is approved by the larger body, that summer programs with the students who are coming into campus, that summer programs preceding the academic year be allowed on a trial basis for basketball players.

We also recommended a host of other initiatives to strengthen the academic accountability aspect. Our job was pure and simple in this particular case to deal with the recruitment problem and to be more specific to the summer recruitment problem.

**Mr. Leland:** Any further questions? We have been here for a long time this morning. (Applause)

Thank you for all your good and interesting questions. We are adjourned.

[The Forum was adjourned at 11:35 a.m.]

# ■ Division II Forum

## Sunday Afternoon, January 7, 2001

The Division II Forum was called to order at 2:09 p.m., with Clint Bryant, director of athletics, Augusta State University and chair of the Division II Management Council, presiding.

### WELCOME

**Mr. Bryant:** Good afternoon. I'm Clint Bryant, chair of the Division II Management Council, and director of athletics for Augusta State University.

I want to take the opportunity to welcome you to the 2001 Division II Issues Forum sponsored by the Division II Management Council. We appreciate you taking the time away from all the excitement of Orlando and the theme parks, to be here for the next two hours.

This year we have three very important issues to address that are significant to all Division II delegates. Please bear with me very quickly as I make some introductions.

[Note: Management Council members were introduced.]

We had tragedy strike our Management Council this past October 31. Jean Bell Chandler, the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and Management Council representative, passed away. She lost her battle with cancer. Please join me to pause for a moment of silence to honor Jean Bell Chandler, who was the interim athletics director and senior women's administrator at Clark Atlanta University.

(A moment of silence was observed.)

Thank you.

Those of you who may be interested in contributing to a scholarship fund, please contact Ruth Reinhardt of the NCAA governance staff. The people at Clark Atlanta are starting a scholarship fund in Jean Bell's name. If you are interested in contributing, please feel free to do so.

### FORUM INTRODUCTION

Now for the business. This forum is designed to allow Division II delegates to discuss the deregulation, legislation and divisional issues that may not normally be discussed at regional seminars or conference meetings.

Three topics will be discussed today: amateurism; Bylaw 15 deregulation; and the work of the Membership Review Project Team.

Please, any time that you go to a microphone, state your name and your institution, because this is being recorded.

We will take questions at the end.

I must remind you, I will be a bit of a stickler for time. Please make your comments as concise and as quickly as possible. Let's make sure we give everyone who may want to speak an opportunity to get to a microphone.

## **AMATEURISM FORUM**

The first topic today will be amateurism issues in Division II. It will run for about 45 minutes. I need to tell you that the project team that's dealing with amateurism issues has worked very hard the past two years. I know that there was a report at last year's Convention. Today, we need you to discuss those issues that you will be voting on tomorrow.

Jerry McGee, the president at Wingate University, has played a substantial role in this process because of being on the Presidents Council. Jerry will start this off on our first topic. Let's welcome Jerry. Thank you. (Applause)

**Jerry McGee** (Wingate University): As you all know, at the very root of this organization that we care so much about is the role of amateurism. Ironically, we have paid very little attention to the definition of amateurism during these 100 years that we've been meeting together.

With this current legislation we're trying to apply some amateurism common sense to pre-enrollment of our student-athletes, just like we have tried to apply amateurism philosophies to people who are already enrolled at our institutions.

This project team has been examining amateurism rules for over two years. It undertook a comprehensive study of these rules, and how they relate to our world today. The project team examined the roots of our amateurism philosophy and the impact our current amateurism legislation is having on prospective student-athletes.

The amateurism proposal that will be before the membership Monday is the best piece of legislation that I have seen during the four years I've been on the Presidents Council. This legislation will enable the Division II membership to address the inconsistencies and problems created by our current rules while addressing competitive inequities within our programs and enhance student-athlete welfare.

Through its many discussions and debates, no one has challenged these proposals and thought about the impact of these proposals more than the project team. The proposal was created with careful consideration, analysis, great deliberation, great debate and extensive education.

Throughout the entire process, the project team sought input and opinions from various groups. From that information is the proposal that we're going to present to you tomorrow. It is the result of a group effort.

Monday morning, we will have the chance to lead the Association forward in a very positive way, as well as enhance the experience of our Division II student-athletes.

At this time, I would like to ask Carol Dunn, who has chaired this project team, to come forward and walk us through a discussion.

**Carol Dunn** (California State University, Los Angeles): Thank you, President McGee. Good afternoon.

There are three areas that I will be addressing today. They are the Amateurism Project Team's existence, the effective date of the legislation, and the compliance efforts that have taken place since we had our Issues Forum this time last year.

As you know, the Amateurism Project Team has been working now for just over two years, but the issue of competitive inequity has been a deep concern of our membership for the last 10. It was that concern that initially was brought forward to the Division II Steering Committee at that time. In consultation with the Division II Steering Committee and the Presidents Council, they determined, because of the concern of membership, that we really needed to form a project team.

The purpose of that project team was simply to determine and investigate whether Division II needed an age rule, similar to that of Division I. The data available to the project team, however, were only data through the clearinghouse. So it shouldn't surprise anyone that we found the average age of student-athletes on elite teams was not significantly higher than those on non-elite teams. Data were not available to the project team regarding whether an elite athlete had extensive competitive experiences.

I can recall very vividly when this report was given on the Convention floor. The membership insisted that we needed to pursue the transfer issue and the competitive inequity. The membership insisted that we needed to move this forward.

Based on the membership's concerns, the project team referred this to the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee to resolve. The Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee had been dealing with a number of issues already, and they immediately referred it to the Management Council and made a recommendation that we put together an Amateurism Project Team for the purpose of reviewing competitive equity of student-athletes of sports, to redefine "amateurism," and to ensure the fair treatment of all student-athletes.

This was an issue that was incorporated into our Division II strategic plan as a major priority. It was obviously also consistent with the many deregulation efforts that have been occurring in Division II.

As the Amateurism Project Team worked through its issues, it had two core principles that guided it in all of its deliberations — student-athlete welfare and competitive equity.

We had goals under these two principles. There were a few things that we wanted to ensure and that we wanted to see happen, including the equitable treatment of students-athletes in sports, increased opportunities for participation and development of a set of proposals that would address the pre-enrollment competitive experiences.

We consulted with a variety of people within membership, outside of membership, a number of different groups. The project team determined that we could deregulate, we could promote student-athlete welfare and we could bring forward legislation that would also ensure competitive equity.

The four areas that we will vote on tomorrow do create equitable treatment for student-athletes. We believe it does so by eliminating the intent to professionalize and replacing it with actual competitive experiences.

It allows prospects in all of our sports to determine their marketability. It increases the participation opportunities by allowing previously ineligible prospects to participate and receive a quality education. It ensures competitive equity through our new seasons of competition rule, which we believe is the cornerstone of our legislation.

The second area that I will address is the effective date of the legislation. The project team had considerable discussion on this issue and determined that the August 2001 effective date was in the best interests and welfare of our student-athletes.

We believe this to be so because any further delay would extend the inequity that currently exists; that the information about the new legislation has been widely distributed; and that coaches will be operating under the same rules, and therefore have the same opportunity to fully inform their prospects of the new legislation and its implications. We believe any further delay beyond 2001 would cause major reinstatement problems, encourage prospects to delay enrollment and de-emphasize academics.

We do believe, however, that there is a need for a waiver for those prospects who have signed a national letter of intent and have committed themselves to an institution during the early signing period. Therefore, any prospect who signed a national letter of intent during the early signing period and met current amateurism rules, but has participated in organized competition after high-school graduation and prior to enrollment, deserves relief.

The project team believes if these criteria are met, the prospect should receive a waiver from the application of the new seasons of competition rule, and therefore not be subject to the reduced seasons of intercollegiate competition.

The final area that I will address is the efforts that have gone on regarding our compliance efforts. If you recall, this issue was brought up at the Issues Forum last year. Let me briefly go over some things that are being considered.

First of all, our Management Council did approve the extension of our entire project team for a minimum of another year. We plan to continue to monitor the efforts of the amateurism deregulation and assist in the implementation of the new proposals.

We continue to be committed to our membership and your concerns. It is our obligation, as we have in the past, to bring forward

any issue that you may have, discuss it openly, and then have some resolve regarding that issue.

We are looking at the squad list form. There are two potential changes that we think might aid in the compliance issue by adding at least two additional columns: One that would include the high-school graduation date; and another column that would determine placing in the number of seasons of competition, pursuant to the new seasons-of-competition rule.

We are looking at re-forming the international student-athlete form. The project team is considering looking into ways that we can make this more effective, and perhaps even more clear, by addressing it from an unethical conduct violation.

The other issue that we have is the Foreign Students Record Committee. Probably more than any other group, this group has taken tremendous initiative. This committee has worked to assist institutions in certifying the eligibility of international student-athletes by determining the expected time it should take to graduate from secondary schools in various countries and the various systems that they have.

The committee expects to finish the top 50 countries from which most of the international students have come by next month. That's February 2001. That's great work, a lot of work, by a wonderful group. This information will be available in the 2002-03 Guide to International Academic Standards for Athletics Eligibility. It will be available on the NCAA Web by August.

Lastly, the regional compliance seminars will continue. We are looking at providing sessions for our members to show how they can more effectively certify student-athletes under the new legislation.

As chair, I get a few liberties, so I'm going to take them now. Before I introduce Tony, I just want to extend a couple of "thank yous."

First of all, on behalf of the project team, we would like to thank the extraordinary, outstanding group of NCAA staff that we have been working with. You only need to be on one committee one time to understand just how wonderful these people are. We are grateful to them for the experience and talents and their genuine commitment to our Division II issues. So to NCAA staff, we thank you.

As chair, I want to thank a very distinguished group that represented us on the project team. They are right here, right now. I would ask our project team to stand and be recognized. (Applause) They represented Division II with integrity and thoughtfulness and wonderful passion. I look forward to working with them for another year.

Finally, on behalf of the project team, we want to thank our membership. Your input and feedback throughout the project team's work has been critical and it has been significant. Together, we feel like we've been able to develop and refine the legislation because of your willingness to share ideas, your concerns and your thoughts. For that, we thank you.

Now, it's my pleasure to introduce Tony Capon, who will be reviewing some additional areas with you.

**Anthony Capon** (University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown): Thank you, Carol.

Like Carol, I want to welcome you to the session. We're glad so many of you are here. I have presented to a number of your conferences over the past six to eight months, so many of you have become familiar with this process.

I, too, as well as Carol and members of the project team want to express our appreciation to you for the feedback that we have received when we have made these presentations at conference meetings and other forums. The feedback that you have given us has been extremely valuable. We've attempted to take that feedback and incorporate it into a set of proposals that we think represents the course of action that the membership wants us to take.

I briefly will be discussing five areas. I will be very brief. These are areas that most of you have already heard about and don't need a great deal of amplification on.

The first discussion is going to be a very brief look at the principle of amateurism. Then we're going to look at the issue of the year in residence. We will be looking at some specific concerns that have been raised about the proposal. We'll take a very brief look again at post-enrollment proposals. Finally we'll have a brief discussion of how these proposals have been packaged.

To start with, we have Principle 2.9 — the principle of amateurism — in NCAA bylaws. The only thing I want to point out is that our legislation that refers to amateurism, refers to student-athletes participating in intercollegiate sport. We do not attempt in the NCAA to regulate all participation in all sport. What we want to be sure of, however, is that those athletes who are participating in our sports are meeting the standards of amateurism.

In addition, nowhere do we say that once you are a professional you are a professional forever. Indeed, we have a great deal of precedent in the NCAA with individuals who have competed as professionals in one sense or another and who have had their eligibility in NCAA sport reinstated.

The next issue that I want to look at is the academic year in residence. This is an issue that as a faculty representative I have felt very strongly about. Our proposal says that if you have done something prior to collegiate enrollment that has triggered the season-of-competition rule, before you can compete at our institution, you must serve an academic year in residence, and you must meet satisfactory progress. We believe that a prospective student-athlete who has graduated from high school and then participates in his or her sport at a high level has demonstrated a commitment to athletics. We believe that that student-athlete should also demonstrate a commitment to academics.

In addition, requiring a year of residence addresses a concern



that we heard early on from the membership: The possibility that schools could recruit prospective student-athletes who had competed at a high level, could bring them in for a single year and could use those athletes, but would not have to demonstrate any commitment to academics in their programs. We would hope that that would not occur in Division II, but there is the possibility. This encourages our schools to recruit only those athletes who we know can succeed academically.

The next of the issues that I want to address briefly, and you'll hear more about this later, are concerns by the high school federation. The national federation has expressed concerns about our proposals. They have said that they are opposed to the pay-for-play proposals that we have made — prize money, salary. They have said they are opposed to allowing high-school students to receive educational stipends. We are not unsympathetic to their concerns. I am not personally, unsympathetic. I have two sons who participate in high-school sports now. I am a high-school football coach. I certainly don't and would not support any proposal that I believe would harm high-school athletics, which is, of course, where we get most of our student-athletes. However, we have looked at these concerns on the project team. We do not believe that the concerns that they have raised are likely to occur.

In addition, we believe that the NCAA should not be in the business of trying to extensively regulate what prospective student-athletes do prior to enrolling in our institutions. We should be concerned if what they do prior to enrolling at our institutions affects how they will perform at our institutions. But if it does not impact the way they are going to compete or succeed in our institutions, we have great concern about saying that we're going to be the policemen of all sports. The federation can enforce its own amateurism rules. We believe that it ought to.

In addition, we do not believe that money is the issue. We believe that the issue is competitive experience. We have tried to get away from a focus on whether or not receiving money is a determining factor in whether or not you gain a competitive advantage. I want to address this though. We have proposed legislation, which will be taken up by the Management Council at their April 2001 meeting, that would result in a prospect triggering the season-of-competition rule if a prospect discontinues full-time high-school enrollment to participate in sport.

So if a student decides he doesn't want to go to high school anymore, and decides he wants to participate in sport, that's going to trigger the season-of-competition rule. We believe this proposal will substantially address the concerns that have been raised.

Another point that we have made numerous times is that our proposals deal with the post-high-school, pre-collegiate enrollment period. The project team has also been charged with looking at the post-enrollment period. To date, we have adopted only one post-

enrollment proposal that would have allowed student-athletes in the Olympics to accept money for Olympic gold medals.

We have not finalized our post-enrollment proposals, but it certainly is safe to say that we do not intend to propose changes in the post-enrollment period that mirror changes in the pre-enrollment period. Once a student-athlete has committed to being a student-athlete at an intercollegiate institution, that student-athlete has agreed to abide by our current regulations, in which being a student first, and being an athlete second, is the principle we wish to follow.

Finally, we have packaged these legislative proposals as a single proposal. If you read the proposals, you'll note that they are divided out by sections. They are done that way because we have to vote on the individual pieces of legislation; they have to be laid out as individual pieces of legislation. But the project team, Management Council and Presidents Council have determined that this is, indeed, an integrated package of proposals.

If we adopt one piece of the proposal and don't adopt another piece of the proposal, it could result in a situation that's worse than the situation we have now. So even though they are listed as separate bylaws, because they are, this is an integrated, packaged set of proposals. That's why it's been put together as a single package. We really find it difficult to separate individual pieces of the proposal out. If we do so, we may run the risk of ending up with inconsistent legislation that leaves us in a worse situation than we're in now.

Finally, these are student-athlete welfare permissive proposals. As Carol said, we believe this is going to accomplish two goals: It's going to increase and promote student-athlete welfare; and it's going to deal with the issue of competitive equity that the membership has been telling us about for a considerable period of time.

Thank you very much. I will now turn it over to Clint to moderate the membership discussion.

**Mr. Bryant:** As you can see, there are microphones. I will recognize you by the number on the microphone. Please try to be concise in your remarks. The microphones are now open for any discussion.

**Dave Waples** (Kennesaw State University): We were told earlier that the NCAA was going to be very lenient on waivers. If you were trying to recruit someone, and the person didn't say anything about signing an earlier letter of intent, then conceivably, since you've been recruiting this person for a period of time, they could be let in under the effective date. That's the first question I'm going to ask.

The second one is, if you read the name of this legislation, it says, "initial enrollment." But it should say, "activities prior to initial enrollment at a United States institution." If you enroll in a foreign university, this is not the same as enrolling in a United States university.

My third thing would be, is this going to stand any legal test? Meaning, if somebody sues because they enrolled in a foreign university right after high school, as compared to enrolling in a United

States university right after high school, is this going to be proven legal, illegal, so forth? Thank you.

**Mr. Bryant:** Dave, I'll let Carol and Tony address Questions 1 and 2, but I can address Question No. 3.

In checking with the legal counsel, our amateurism legislation or proposal is on solid legal ground.

**Ms. Dunn:** In terms of the first part of your question, we, too, have been very sensitive to the fact of deviating from that national letter of intent. But one of the areas that we felt was very important was the early signing of a national letter of intent. It's something that we could put our arms around. It was something that was very definitive.

However, I think it's also important that as a membership, we also be sensitive to this issue and that this would not preclude any member from going forward to the Administrative Review Committee with additional cases, and, of course, compelling rationale in those situations.

So in either one of those cases, these can be taken to the Administrative Review Committee, as in any other type of waiver situation.

**Mr. Capon:** Just to add one comment on that. As a member of the Administrative Review Subcommittee, certainly one of the things we're going to look at is the intent when the institution signs a student-athlete. I'm only one member of the committee, but certainly we're going to want to do what is in the best interests of the student-athletes, and we certainly don't want to put a student-athlete in an unfair situation.

We have adopted an automatic waiver for those institutions that sign a student-athlete prior to January — the adoption date of this. But other student-athletes and institutions can come forward to ARS with waiver requests. We certainly will look at those very carefully.

You learn something every day. I apparently misspoke this morning in one of the conference meetings. I was under the impression that this applied to enrollment in a U.S. college. I was informed by Julie that it applies to any intercollegiate enrollment. So if you enroll in a foreign institution, only participation prior to enrollment in that collegiate institution would count against the season-of-competition rule.

If you go to a foreign college and participate in athletics while you were there, that does not trigger the season-of-competition rule because this only applies to precollegiate enrollment at any college or university, worldwide, if I'm correct.

**James Watson** (West Liberty State College): I'm a member of the NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee.

The NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee was established at the 1991 NCAA Convention, in part, to maintain and improve communications among associations, the Olympic movement and numerous other amateur athletic interests.

As the Division II Management Council representative to this committee, I participated in the committee's evaluation of the NCAA amateurism deregulation. The committee would like to congratulate the Division II membership for taking a leadership role in advancing these proposals for consideration at this Convention.

The committee's preliminary evaluation is that the deregulation will benefit student-athletes involved, particularly with Olympic sports and at the elite level. We do appreciate Division II's willingness to continue to assist us in monitoring amateurism deregulation and other changes in Division II legislation that would impact the Olympic movement. Thank you.

**Jean Cerra** (Barry University): As far as the early signing date is concerned, just some clarification. That doesn't apply to all sports, is that correct? Some sports are precluded?

**Mr. Bryant:** Yes, they are. You are correct.

**Ms. Cerra:** I am correct.

And we're on solid legal ground? We're providing equal protection for all student-athletes who may be enrolling in September? Remember, I'm from Florida. Equal protection has been discussed a lot in our state lately. I want to make sure that we're not up before the U.S. Supreme Court again wondering about equal protection here.

**Ms. Dunn:** I wanted you and the membership to know, we did discuss this particular issue with Elsa Cole, the NCAA legal counsel. She assures us that we are on solid ground.

**Ms. Cerra:** So even though some sports are going to be excluded from the exemption, we don't have a problem?

**Ms. Dunn:** That is accurate. The ones who have the opportunity for an early signing date are signing under a very different set of regulations. It's the project team's view that that is an automatic. That's a no-brainer. They need to be waived.

We also feel that there has to be from the membership's view compelling information for those situations that occur after that time period — even for those sports that don't have the opportunity to sign early. We recognize they may be committed to your institution. It's up to the institution to try to provide the type of rationale that they know can move it forward to the Administrative Review Committee.

**Mr. Bryant:** Another thing, Jean. I don't think anyone's going to be excluded from the waiver process.

**Ms. Cerra:** Right. They have to go through a waiver process. Then it becomes selective as to which ones are approved and which ones are not, correct?

**Mr. Bryant:** Yes.

**Ms. Dunn:** Yes.

**Ms. Cerra:** Now, another question. You clarified that the enrollment could be at a non-U.S. institution. Could a student go to a foreign institution, graduate and still come in the fall of this next year as a graduate student and not have to sit out a year?

**Mr. Capon:** That's correct. They would be subject to the transfer requirements that we have in our current legislation. While they are enrolled in that foreign institution, they would also be subject to the amateurism regulations for post-enrolled student-athletes, not pre-enrolled. So this would not affect them.

**Ms. Cerra:** Right. They are currently completing the equivalent of a bachelor's degree at another institution abroad and would be coming as a graduate student to a U.S. institution.

**Mr. Capon:** Nothing in our proposals would change the way those prospective student-athletes are dealt with in the NCAA. We only are dealing with — as I've had clarified to me now — precollegiate enrollment in any college, anywhere. So they would meet the usual transfer regulations that are now in effect.

**Ms. Cerra:** Okay. Thank you.

**Stephanie Harris** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Saint Leo University): We would like to say that we believe that it is essential to pass this legislation tomorrow because it hits at the heart of Division II of the National Collegiate Athletic Association student-athlete welfare and competitive equity. Our committee believes that this legislation will shift the focus of athlete eligibility to what is important — competition — instead of focusing on money.

We also would like to express that this legislation also hits at the heart of what the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee stands for: Creating opportunities for student-athletes. By passing this legislation, including the academic year in residence, we will be ensuring that we are meeting the needs of student-athletes.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee knows that each person in this room is here for a common purpose: To enhance the experience of all of our Division II athletes. This legislation is an excellent way for you to make a long-lasting and positive impact on the lives of thousands of people like those of us who serve on the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and who want the opportunity to compete in our division.

**Mr. Bryant:** Thank you.

**Doug Echols** (South Atlantic Conference): I would like for someone to explain the exception that's been provided to skiing in Bylaw 14.2.4.2.2.4, two-year exemption.

**Mr. Capon:** In looking at applying the proposals that we have come up with to sports, the skiing federation and the NCAA Skiing Committee came to us and said that they believed that their sport has some unique circumstances about it.

One of the unique circumstances is that there are very few high-school ski teams in the U.S. It's not a sport that's widely competed. As a result, the skiing teams in the U.S. that are competing intercollegiately, recruit their skiers from non-high-school areas. They pointed out to us in an early document that the typical student-athlete participating on a Division I or Division II ski team — and this was 75 to 80 percent of them — had spent two or three years post high-

school enrollment trying out for their national team. If they don't make the national team, they then go to college.

The ski people said if we apply the proposals to skiing, we're going to basically double their recruiting because they are only going to have these individuals for two years instead of four years.

In addition, a major reason we're proposing these changes in the first place is to address competitive equity. The skiing people said, "We don't have a competitive equity problem because most of our student-athletes are in the same situation." Therefore, they came to us as well as the Division I committee, and said, "We believe that our circumstance is unique."

We made it clear to other sports that if they believe that they have a unique circumstance that would justify some variation, that they certainly can bring it to our attention in the next year because we're going to be looking at this over the next year, and we will address it.

But that's the justification for skiing. There are only a handful of Division II schools that have skiing.

**Robert Dranoff** (Dowling College): With this legislation, can you tell us what kind of tools are in place now to help us monitor the pre-enrollment seasons of practice for the international students?

**Mr. Capon:** There are a couple of ways you're going to monitor it. If you're an athletics director and one of your coaches comes to you and says he has this 23-year-old soccer player from overseas and would like to bring that student-athlete in and give him financial aid, my assumption is the first question you're going to ask is, "Why is the student-athlete worth financial aid?"

Our coaches are not going to Europe and hanging around on playgrounds, attempting to find student-athletes. They find them either through their connections that they have in other countries or through the Internet.

When coaches bring in student-athletes who have competitive experience from other countries, the coach can very easily document for you what league that individual participated in. If it's a sport like soccer, they can go much further than that. They can tell you how many goals they had, how many assists they had. That information is widely available on the Internet.

Coaches are not recruiting student-athletes about whom they have no information. We believe that the student-athletes who are being recruited have well-documented experiences. We will know the leagues in which they participated. We may not know, for example, whether a particular student-athlete who participated on a particular team received payment. We will know, however, that that student-athlete participated in a league in which there were professionals. We don't believe it's going to be that difficult to make that determination. In addition if you're bringing in a student-athlete who is at a fairly high level, there are going to be other student-athletes already here who know the level of the leagues in which that individual participated.

So we think it's a manageable task. Certainly, if you're going to recruit someone who has been out of school for a number of years, that's a question as an athletics director you're going to want to ask your coach.

**Ms. Dunn:** I would also address the compliance issues that we are looking at thus far. There are many other areas that we will need to address. Certainly this is only one component of that. We will continue to move forward and review these things as carefully as we can as a project team.

**Kelly Higgins** (University of South Dakota): I want to get back to Doug Echols' question. I think he had a very good question. I know I talked with you earlier this morning, Tony, about that question. I was chair of the student committee at the time of its institution. I think the question actually might be more of a Division I issue here. Am I correct, Tony?

**Mr. Capon:** I beg your pardon. I couldn't hear you.

**Mr. Higgins:** In essence, there is no Division II sport there as a national championship. In essence, since there is no amateurism deregulation at this particular point that would have a major affect on Division II institutions, that could only carry steam. Am I correct? Is that one of the salient items used on that? Is that the salient point?

I'm concerned about the two-year exemption. Is that going to be reviewed in two years to be renewed, or to be remanded?

**Mr. Capon:** I don't believe the intent was to carve out a two-year temporary exception. The intent was to carve out an exception for two years, which would apply from now until the membership decides to change it.

**Julie Roe** (NCAA Staff): That is correct, Tony.

I wasn't introduced. I'm Julie Roe. I'm part of the NCAA staff.

The skiing committee came to the Division I and II groups mainly because it did not want this legislation to have a negative impact on the national sport of skiing. They claim that for U.S. students, it would have that sort of an impact.

As far as your question with regard to Division II specific, if Division II were to adopt this, because of the exception, and because of the situation that the skiing committee described, there should not be an impact between Division I and II, even if Division I does not adopt.

**Mr. Higgins:** I go back to the same question. I think it's a very good point, and I understand the exception made. My question goes back to looking at the extent and nature of the skiing community itself. Because primarily, the top 20 skiers in all events are almost all foreign athletes and older, for the most part. Was that an issue raised and discussed at any time?

**Ms. Roe:** That was not an issue that was raised. Going back to Tony's earlier point, the ski committee did not think that this two-year exception would create any competitive inequity, but rather would prevent any negative impact, generally, for Division II skiing.

**Mr. Higgins:** I just wanted to ask the question.

**Barbara Burke** (Hawaii Pacific University): I was wondering if the project team looked at the financial impact that the year of residency would have on international students. Most international students are not eligible for a number of other types of financial aid.

**Mr. Capon:** The student-athlete can receive aid on the same basis that a registered student-athlete can receive aid.

We certainly red-shirt a lot of our student-athletes now in Division II, and they would be eligible for aid under the same standard. An institution is going to have to make a decision, with limited financial aid dollars, where you wish to allocate those dollars. But that's a decision we make every day.

**Ms. Burke:** I understand. Our institution probably has a much higher number of international athletes than many other institutions. It would impact us greatly if we were to tell all of our international students who maybe had prior competitive experience that they had to register for a year.

On our student-athlete advisory committee, there's great concern among the international athletes that they would not be able to afford that first year.

**Mr. Bryant:** If I'm not mistaken, all international students have to provide an I-20 Form. That I-20 Form states that they are financially capable of handling the expenses while in this country if they are given a visa to come here to participate. I think that is taken care of already through the immigration statute.

**Ms. Burke:** I may not be aware, but wouldn't their student-athlete financial aid be included in that I-20?

**Mr. Bryant:** Yes, it is.

**Ms. Burke:** So if we take away the student-athlete financial aid, then they have lost perhaps 50, 75, 80 percent of their tuition money for that first year.

I just think this is a concern that really only impacts institutions that have a large number of international athletes. I probably am well in the minority here, but I thought I would bring that up as a hardship that's perceived by students on our campus.

**Robert Kanaby** (National High School Federation): I'm the executive director of the national high school federation. I want to thank you for providing us with this opportunity to come before you.

I feel a little bit like the man at the wheel of the ship that's approaching the final wave in "The Perfect Storm." But nevertheless, I am here to present a point of view. Thank you, also, for providing us with the opportunity to present that point of view to each of you. I'd also commend the open process that has been involved in the determination of this program to date, and for providing the national federation, which is an associate member of the NCAA, with this opportunity to come before you.

Some measures of the proposals, believe it or not, we do support. I have personally recommended to our membership that we take



some very hard and serious looks at our own definitions of “amateurism” as they relate to such things as operational goals and participation with professionals.

Others, however, in the high-school community believe this proposal really destroys the educational-based athletics conditions that we have supported for the decades we have been in existence. Some of our member state associations trace their amateurism rules back to the 19th century.

Specifically, we talk about pay-for-play, pay-for-victory and tuition reimbursements. The 50 state high-school activity and athletic associations, plus the District of Columbia, have unanimously rejected those three proposals as part of this plan. They also have been rejected unanimously by the national federation of coaches association, representing more than 31,000 high-school coaches. They have been rejected unanimously by the National Interscholastic Athletic Administrators Association, which is the largest organization of secondary school athletic administrators in the nation, more than 6,000 strong. The proposals have been rejected by the executive body of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, representing more than 42,000 secondary and middle school principals across the United States.

All organizations voted unanimously against the concepts of pay-for-play, pay-for-victory and tuition reimbursement payments by third-party high schools for pre-graduated high-school students.

The reason we believe that you exist and serve the 330,000 student-athletes as capably as you do, and that we exist to serve the 6.5 million student-athletes that we do, is to keep the educational philosophies in the primary role of educational athletic programs. There is no greater core value than that.

The pay-for-play proposals in this legislation undermine that core value in the professional opinion of every secondary school organization I've named.

Let us be clear about what this legislation means. It means that it's going to be okay for high school students — before they graduate, as long as they remain enrolled, whether they are in high school programs or not, but as long as they remain enrolled in high school — to get paid \$50, \$100, \$500, for playing in a summer basketball league game. They can be paid \$1,000 for winning a road-running race. Maybe Foot Locker will add a \$1,000 first prize to their programs for that. Tuition reimbursement payments could actually be paid by agents or others who influence young people.

You recommend that we enforce our existing rules, and we will. But I urge you to understand that we cannot hold the line alone. We need your support to transmit to student-athletes a seamless philosophy in this matter.

You obviously believe in each and every one of these things as a condition of amateurism for your students because you continue to enforce every single one of the things that I have identified as being

detrimental to our programs once they enroll in your institutions.

You have also — appropriately perhaps, but we do not agree — indicated that you have no business telling pre-enrolled students what to do. The Division I Basketball Issues Committee is going in the exact opposite direction. Why? Because they are tired of dealing with the parallel systems that are already in place for young people to get involved with beyond high-school programs.

An unintended consequence of this action will be the development of generations of athletes who will expect to be paid for their services, who will expect to be paid for their victories and who will easily fall into relationships with agents. Then somehow, once they become enrolled in your institutions, they are expected to sever all of those expectations and all of those ties?

We urge you to defeat this legislation and to continue to work with us and within your own existing systems under which you can deal with an international student or you can deal with a youngster who signs a professional baseball contract, goes away for a month, and is not able to make the team and wants to come back. But deal with those situations within your own framework of rules and regulations, because we, on the high-school level, do that on a year-in, year-out basis, as well.

Thank you for this opportunity to come before you. I would be happy to answer any questions later, and be available if anyone wishes to speak to me about this.

**Heather Andrews** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Missouri Southern State College): I serve as the chair of the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee as well as a representative of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee to the Amateurism Project Team.

If I heard right, there was a reference to agents. The Amateurism project team by no means endorses agents. That's a relationship that we are not permitting pre-enrolled collegiate athletes to have at all. Nor will they have that once they are enrolled. We kind of look at agents as corrupt, so we don't support that at all.

On top of that, speaking on behalf of student-athletes, it should be the student-athlete's decision as to whether they can accept money or not. Once again, what we have to think of here is not the money. It's giving these individuals a competitive advantage that we're worried about. Thank you.

**Mr. Capon:** There are a couple of issues there.

First of all, we consider it unlikely that anyone is going to establish a league comprised of 14-year-olds who are going to be earning salaries. I know in my area that there isn't a single high-school athlete — probably within a 50-mile radius of where I live — who is in any way at the level that it would take to compete as a professional.

Second of all, it's already happening in some areas. For example, good tennis players make a decision about whether or not they want to go on a professional tour or whether or not they want to play high-

school tennis. If you ask what high-school Venus and Serena Williams played for, the answer is they didn't play. They made a decision. Student-athletes are already doing that. We don't anticipate this is going to change.

Furthermore, we don't anticipate that there are going to be real problems with prize money. Our view on that is, if the student-athlete wishes to run in a road race in the summer in high school — they're already doing it; they're already winning gym bags and they're winning other forms of reimbursement — we don't see how that undermines high-school athletics.

Heather's point is correct about agents. The educational stipend legislation specifically excludes agents, boosters and other such individuals.

However, as I and Carol said earlier, we are going to monitor this very carefully over the first year. If it has the kinds of consequences that some have said it will, then we will propose legislation to deal with it.

One more final element on this. If you look at the sport of baseball, there is nothing that prohibits major league baseball from signing 14-year-olds. Why don't they? Obviously they sign them right out of high school. There are two answers: Number one, it's not profitable to do so. You're not going to make money in minor league baseball with a bunch of teenagers. Second of all, it's political suicide. We don't anticipate that there are going to be leagues developing, comprised of sophomores and juniors. If something like that arises, we will certainly propose legislation to deal with it.

**Ms. Dunn:** I would just like to add that this is one of the things that the project team did look at — the case precedent that's currently been going on in Division II relative to prize money. I think what you will find, as we found, that those opportunities were extremely limited in Division II.

**Mr. Bryant:** I would also caution the membership not to confuse this with Division I legislation. This is Division II amateurism. I think that what the Division I basketball issues committee is dealing with is a whole different animal. I don't think it should get confused here.

**Ms. Cerra** (Barry University): Carol, I would like to compliment you and the project team for an outstanding job and an outstanding piece of legislation that addresses a very difficult and a very sensitive topic. I think you all should be commended for a job well done. (Applause)

I would like some clarification about two or three points before we vote on this legislation to make sure that we're all clear on this.

First of all, the issue regarding the exemption for national team participation that meets the criteria A, B and C on Page 21. Essentially, am I correct in saying that someone could play on a national team abroad for three years, one of which is for a national team that qualifies for Olympic competition, and only have to count

two of those three years?

**Mr. Capon:** That's correct.

**Ms. Cerra:** Is the same thing true if they're enrolled in a prep school after high school? If an international student competed two years abroad and then comes to the U.S. and enrolls in a prep school after high school, would you have to count that one season of prep school participation?

**Julie Roe** (NCAA Staff): You can apply for the prep school exemption one time. So even though the national competition exemption, which is also a one-time application, had already been applied in your scenario, the prep school exception still remains to be applied.

So in your scenario, if the prospect competed for two years for a national team, and then came to the U.S. and enrolled in a prep school for one year, and then enrolled in college, they would have used the national exception for their first year, and they would have also applied to prep school. So the end result would be they would be charged with one season of eligibility, have three remaining, and, of course, fulfill the applicable year in residence.

**Ms. Cerra:** So they can't double dip, in other words.

**Ms. Roe:** They can't.

**Ms. Cerra:** That's what I wanted to clarify.

I guess the last clarification I need here is the skiing exemption. I think that's come up before. I think the rationale that was given was that that particular committee came forth and said that they didn't feel there was going to be any inherent competitive advantage with the two-year exception.

My question is, were other sport committees, particularly those in open championships, given that opportunity to respond, as well? If the international influence is used as rationale for this legislation why can't it be used in all other sports? I don't understand why skiing is the only one.

**Ms. Dunn:** Jean, we consulted with each one of the sports committees. The Skiing Committee was the only sports committee that came forward with additional information for us.

**Ms. Cerra:** They are the only ones that came forward and said it's not a competitive advantage to have international students?

**Mr. Capon:** Yes.

**Ms. Cerra:** Had others done that, would they have been exempted, as well?

**Ms. Dunn:** If others had come forward, we would have taken a very careful look at it before making a decision.

**Ms. Cerra:** Thank you.

## MEMBERSHIP REVIEW PROJECT TEAM

**Mr. Bryant:** Thank you very much for your patience. We appreciate your questions.

We were going to go to the deregulation forum, but I'm going to come to that last and move on to the work of the Membership Review

Project Team because I know a lot of you are interested in that.

At this time, I would like to call the following people to the podium: Jim Watson, Dave Brink, Jerry Hughes, Barb Schroeder, Charles Dunn and Kay Schallenkamp.

We have an opportunity every year at this Convention to deal within the Issues Forum an issue that is before us and to propose legislation for the upcoming Convention. Any legislation that's proposed in this area will be going to the 2002 Convention.

The membership moratorium gives us a chance to analyze our current, active and provisional membership requirements and determine if changes are necessary before we start accepting new Division II applications next year.

I know there has been a lot of talk out there that this project team is off-base and driven by some elite Division II conferences. I can assure you, as a member of this project team and as chair of the Management Council, that it is healthy conversation for our division to periodically review membership. That's what it is. Today, we are giving you an opportunity to look at some issues that this project team is starting to address.

The purpose of today is to receive feedback from the membership to help guide our course as we prepare to propose legislation, if any, for the next Convention. I know the project team is due to meet the first of February. Those comments, plus what you guys have to say, will go a long way in helping us develop some understanding from the membership.

With that, I think I need to turn the microphone over to Jim Watson, the AD at West Liberty State.

**James Watson** (West Liberty State University): Thank you, Clint. Good afternoon, everyone.

When the moratorium for Division II membership was put in place last year as a result of a clear pattern of substantial potential membership growth, it became clear that there would be a need for a project team to study the complexity of the entire issue related to membership. Little did we know then, exactly how complex the situation would become.

Our first meeting was a phone meeting last June, and we began to organize for this task. We realized that it would be an arduous one. Then we came together in late summer in Denver and began to brainstorm and to take a look at what was out there.

It was very clear that we needed to take a comprehensive look not only at issues related to the potential new applicants to Division II, but all classes of members — those that are currently in the provisional cycle and those of us that are active members.

So we began to look at the various issues and how they were intertwined. We decided that we needed to have a comprehensive review and a thorough discussion of potential requirements that we feel are appropriate for new members, as well as how well we were accomplishing our mission in the educational assessment and provi-

sional cycle, as well as how well we were supporting and monitoring our current active membership, in terms of their compliance with membership requirements.

The scope of the review would begin with the complete review of the past history of how we have graded applicants in terms of their desire to access Division II membership. We also felt it was very appropriate to take a look at our current sports sponsorship requirements, to be sure that they were in keeping with what our membership felt was appropriate for our Division II philosophy.

The issue of financial aid became part of the discussion. As you know, we have maximum equivalencies. It's only fair to ask if it is appropriate to possibly consider minimums of financial aid requirements in Division II.

The issue of scheduling — right now the focus is primarily on football and men's and women's basketball — is something that is very important in terms of meeting membership requirements. But as we all know, qualifications for regional postseason play requires — at least it's implicit — that one should schedule the preponderance of their games against Division II opponents, particularly in their region. So we felt it appropriate to review scheduling requirements as well.

We are a conference-based division for the most part. Therefore, implications of any membership changes, any impact on conferences, needed to be reviewed at that time.

We will be reconvening for our third in-person meeting next month. At that time, very high on the agenda for that meeting will be the review of what standards might be appropriate for future applicants to the Division II membership.

We need to look at our provisional educational cycle that I mentioned a minute ago. We think we have done a very nice job through this cycle in creating an opportunity for new members to be educated and brought into active membership so that they can be model institutions — unlike many of us who came in when there was little or no instruction, simply an anticipation that you would be in full compliance.

However, as we have proceeded through this development of the educational assessment process, we have found a need to annually revise and tweak some of the requirements and the methodology that we have been imposing. We felt it's appropriate to evaluate that divisional educational process again.

Whatever we do, we need to be sure that our recommendations are grounded in the Division II philosophy statement. We need to periodically review and be sure that the Division II philosophy statement is representative of the identity that the membership of Division II wishes to portray.

With that being said, I'm going to turn it over to Jerry Hughes.

Before I do that, I want to remind all of you that we are very interested in your feedback. There is a feedback form that is avail-

able here in the room. We want input. We welcome it. We will periodically be updating the membership on the progress of this charge. Thank you.

**Jerry Hughes** (Central Missouri State University): Thank you, Jim.

I'm going to move into the sports sponsorship arena of the things that we have talked about. We're going to try to move through this quickly to leave time to ask questions on some of the things we have discussed.

As you know, our current legislation requires that we have four men's and four women's programs, two team sports of each gender. Division I sports can count toward sport sponsorship.

If you look at the slide that's up there now, that gives you a current profile of the Division II membership as it relates to sport sponsorship. There are a couple that are below four. This came from the research staff. We think that is either an error in the research data as it was gathered or a provisional member that has not had to achieve the number of four.

The next slide mirrors women's sport sponsorship opportunities as they currently exist in the division. As you see, there is an institution that is below four. We think the same case that I earlier alluded to occurs here.

So we might recommend going to five men, five women, a total of 10 sports; or, an institution would have the option of achieving that with four men, six women. Currently, Division III has already enacted, and it will go into effect a year from now, the five and five for their membership — 10 sports, five and five.

We also talked about six men, six women, or five men, seven women. We even had some discussions, since we are currently at four and four, of having four men and a total of 12 in your program so that we would not be causing anyone with an increase in sport sponsorship or a problem with gender equity to add men's opportunities.

Other considerations that we discussed included if we should continue to allow Division I sports to count toward a Division II minimum. Additionally, indoor and outdoor track count as one sport in Division II. Should we consider letting indoor and outdoor track count as two sports since we host two championships?

I'm now going to turn it over to Dave Brunk to discuss financial aid.

**David Brunk** (Northeast-10 Conference): Thank you, Jerry.

As Jim alluded to earlier, part of our discussion focused on the possible establishment of minimum financial aid requirements. As you know, currently there are no minimum financial aid requirements in Division II or Division III. The Division II philosophy permits athletically related aid. Division III does not. So we pose the question, should Division II consider minimum financial aid thresholds?

If we do establish a minimum financial aid requirement, let's look

at some of the options that the group discussed.

First, do we require at least 50 percent of maximum grants in a minimum number of Division II sports? Do we require a minimum number of total equivalencies, with at least 50 percent of the total being provided in women's sports? Do we require a minimum aggregate expenditure in athletics aid? Do we establish a minimum requirement that provides consideration to need-based aid?

Some other considerations that we talked about was the inclusion or exclusion of basketball aid. We discussed the grandfathering of current nonscholarship institutions and discussed the inclusion or exclusion of aid awarded in Division I sports.

The NCAA research staff provided some data for us regarding a financial aid profile for Division II. It was interesting to note that the vast majority of the Division II institutions provided at least \$250,000 to \$999,000 in aid.

I would like to turn to it over now to Barb Schroeder. Barb's going to discuss scheduling.

**Barbara Schroeder** (Regis University): Thanks, Dave. I guess that means I'm "it." We're tag-teaming it a little bit here.

The area of scheduling requirements is one that we also talked about in terms of how this could potentially affect our championships and our eligibility for championships.

Under our current legislation, 50 percent of contests in football and men's and women's basketball must be conducted against Division II or I institutions. Those are the only three sports that we currently have legislated minimum contests against Division II opponents.

When we look at options for potential scheduling or alternatives for that, one of the questions is, would we want to require additional scheduling requirements in other team sports? We have those three. We will get to what we have talked about with individual sports. But do we want to extend this to other team sports? Is this something that we want to entertain as an option to strengthen our other team sport programs?

Another option would be eliminating current requirements and to limit minimums to championship qualification requirements. Currently, some sport programs have a minimum requirement of contests versus Division II schools in order to qualify for championships. In men's and women's basketball, for example, you need to play 22 games against Division II or I opponents to be eligible for a Division II championship. Do we want to get into that? Do we want to strengthen that across the board for other team sports?

Other considerations along these lines would be to take a look at the individual sport requirements. We didn't do a lot of that. We felt that at this point, the main thrust would be in the team sport options. That probably will be down the list of priorities for us at this point.

What's going to be the relationship to the regionalization policy? If we make changes in the scheduling requirements, will this be in



conflict with our current philosophy of regionalization? Does our scope broaden even more? What impact would regionalization have on the Championships Committee?

The last thing would be the effect on sports with low sponsorship numbers. We have, for example, a sport that only has 13 Division II members, but we still conduct a Division II championship in that sport. Are we going to need to establish some minimums in those sports as well?

Possible additional conference requirement alternatives was another area that we felt needed to be looked at. Would we, for example, need to conduct championships in a minimum number of sports, or require conferences to sponsor championships in a minimum number of sports? Do we want to set a minimum threshold there? Do we want to develop an educational program for new conferences?

If we do have the influx of membership that we think we may have after the moratorium is lifted, we could potentially be taking on whole new conferences — not just individual members around the country joining other conferences, but bringing in new conferences as a whole group. Do we need to take a look at how to educate those conferences as a group?

The last possible requirement for conferences would be to take a look at establishing a conference institutional self-study or something thereof in the terminology.

I think that's my last thing. I'll turn it back to Clint for a wrap-up. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Bryant:** One of the things that occurred in developing this project team, was that I was asked, as chair of the Management Council, to pick a chair for this committee. I didn't hesitate at all in selecting Lynn Dorn from North Dakota. You might not always agree with Lynn, but you know she's thorough and she's fair. Once given a project, she will use all her energies to do what's best for Division II.

Lynn was unable to make it because of some campus commitments. At the last moment, she had to pull out of coming to the Convention. We didn't know until Friday afternoon that Lynn would be unable to make it. She has been named interim AD there. There were some things that came up on campus that she had to deal with.

But believe me, I know that she will dedicate her time to do what's best for Division II. I assure you that this project team, over the next several months, will get input from you guys.

I would like to go over the project team's plan of action.

Number one would be assistance from commissioners to determine the impact of the changes on member institutions. We've already started that process. We met with the commissioners back in December.

The project team might conduct a membership survey during the spring of 2001. We're going to review membership feedback and determine whether to recommend changes to the Management Council and Presidents Council in the summer of 2001 for the mem-

bership to possibly consider as legislation for January 2002.

That ends our report. The microphones are now open. Please give us some feedback.

**Dave Waples** (Kennesaw State University): I have a few little comments. If it ain't broke...

We've had a deregulation session. Now we're going into a regulation session as far as I'm concerned. All of this sounds like it's going to cost somebody some money. I think that's one of the things that we try to do — save people money.

We seem to be doing a lot of things. I'm certain they are very good things, but what if the big schools, the Division I schools, decide to drop out of this organization and form their own? Which is a possibility.

I suggest we take all of the money we can and put it into a trust fund that can run our championships until the day that this organization dies. If we don't, if we spend all this money on everything but what we should be spending it on, which is championships, and that day happens when the big schools drop out, we're going to be right back where most of us were — spending \$30,000 to \$40,000 a year trying to get to the championships.

**Mr. Bryant:** I think what will happen, as you will very well see tomorrow in a presentation by the Budget...

[Note: The NCAA logo fell from the stage curtain.]

**Mr. Bryant:** Dave, you just killed the NCAA. (Laughter) You just killed it. Pull your shotguns out, the NCAA has been killed.

You will see in a presentation given tomorrow by Dr. Bernard Franklin, the vice-chair of the Presidents Council, along with Don Lubbers, the Presidents Council spell out exactly and strategically how our money will be spent across the division.

I know for the next 12 years, due to the CBS contract, that we're not going to be worried about championships and a lot of other issues. So I think you'll get those concerns addressed tomorrow.

**Steve Murray** (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): I want to echo the same words as the coach from Kennesaw State on a couple of categories that were spoke about today.

The move to add sports seems reasonable in light of where Division III is going. I hope that the committee takes a very conservative approach to any sports that would be added in the future. I think some schools in our division would have an adverse effect on that. I hope that any move that the committee makes in that direction next year protects the institutions that are currently in our division.

Additionally, regarding the scheduling requirements relative to NCAA postseason play, I would hope that is best left to the sports Championships Committee. I know basketball has moved in that direction. It kind of takes care of itself, relative to those sports. I think the sports committees have the best avenue to control that issue in areas that they have a little better expertise on, relative to

their regions around the country.

I'm a little concerned, as was mentioned, about the intent of Division II to deregulate ourselves, and now we're talking about adding a scholarship minimum requirement. We are distinguished from Division III in that we allow scholarships. Division III does not, although many of you do know that they probably spend more money than us.

But this conversation leads me to think about the late '80s Division I NCAA Convention. Division I started adding new minimum spending requirements and scheduling requirements. We're starting to sound a little bit like Division I today. That is disconcerting to me.

From my standpoint, from my conference's standpoint — I don't know if other conferences feel this way, the other institutions — I would like to throw up a big yellow caution sign in front of this committee and say, let's take this very carefully and make sure that we're doing the best thing for our current members. Then let's start thinking about the new members that might be coming in. Thank you.

**James Watson** (West Liberty State College): Steve, in response to your remarks — and you know what I'm going to say here — if the group remembers, we did a survey of the membership back in the mid '90s to find out exactly where you stood on various issues. One of the interesting things about that survey was that it indicated you wanted the Association and the committees to study a number of issues. One very important one was the level of financial aid.

That led to a project team that I was fortunate enough to serve on. Over a two-year period, we did an exhaustive study of options that this membership could consider for financial aid changes. In the final analysis, the division voted to leave everything the same. We made no substantial changes in the financial aid. In a post-survey, the interesting results indicated that you continued to want us to still study the issue.

So when I said earlier that it was appropriate for us to have the discussion in all of these areas, it is because of exactly what Clint has said about Lynn Dorn's leadership and the thoroughness that is necessary when you get into a complex issue like this.

So be sure to understand that this discussion is not a one-sided discourse leading to any one particular model. It's simply the beginning of a process to be sure that all of our committees are responsive to the membership and have a sense of when change is appropriate, and as was stated, when to leave things alone, which is the conclusion that we may very well reach.

**Charles Dunn** (Henderson State University): Let me add my words to that.

I heard the word "conservative" mentioned out there. I'd like to assure you that my sense is that the committee is moving in that direction, very conservatively. They have listed a lot of possibilities on the board for us to consider. All of it is designed to better represent

Division II, to come up with criteria that reflects what we are, as opposed to what we were, or what we might have been five or 10 or 15 years ago.

I can say very simply that the committee is not of one mind, and it's not moving forward in one mind. It has a variety of opinions that are being expressed at every meeting. I'm confident that what we come out with will reflect what you want in Division II.

**Barry Blizzard** (West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I represent a conference of 15 very diverse institutions and a conference that's been together in some way, shape or form since the mid 1920s. I know that the Division II philosophy statement allows financial aid, but it also allows institutional diversity and institutional prerogatives in how that aid is given.

I think that has been a strength of our conference, to allow institutions, while operating under a set of rules, to still be very diverse in their athletic program. I think that's also a strength of Division II.

I would urge the project team to keep this in mind as they move forward with their consideration and their possible legislation. We have a lot of different types of institutions in this division. I think they are all worthy and valuable members of the division. Their individualism needs to be respected. I would urge the project team to keep that in mind as they move forward.

One of the original reasons for having this study was to come up with incoming-member requirements. Do those, in effect, need to be the exact same requirements as for active members? Are we getting in a legal situation there, where those have to be exactly the same?

**Mr. Bryant:** One of the things, Jerry, I think we can answer, is that that was not the charge of the committee. One of the things we set down in this moratorium, as you remember, was that this project team's initiative was to look at the growth, and then we changed that to review.

**Mr. Blizzard:** Right.

**Mr. Bryant:** Our legal counsel had some concern with having the name of "growth" because it might be assumed that we were going to do something to deny people an opportunity to become a part of our division.

I think that in order for you to adequately decide what the requirements are going to be for people coming in, you need to periodically review where your membership is currently. That's a part of this whole process.

I see at the microphones Steve, and now you, and now Doug. I just had a bullet up there, "Assistance from the Commissioners." I know you guys are going to give us some assistance as we look at this.

**Mr. Blizzard:** We're your assistants, believe me.

But again, I'll re-emphasize. Preserve the freedom that we give to our institutions to be different. I guess that's the main thing I wanted to say. Thank you.

**Mr. Bryant:** Jim Watson had a conversation with our legal coun-

sel, Elsa Cole. I would like for Jim to share that.

**James Watson** (West Liberty State College): Thank you, Clint.

Last night, our chief legal counsel, Elsa Cole, who most of you know, was good enough to spend some time with me, to give me a comfort level in some of the areas that she had outlined in an earlier opinion last spring, shortly after the moratorium was imposed.

I think some of us feel — I think all of us do on the team — that each time we appear close to making a decision, and certainly even prior to that, we need to go back to our legal people and draw on their expertise so that we don't develop something that appears to be ideal in our minds as laypeople, only to find that it will not be defensible under legal scrutiny.

We had a very productive conversation. She has assured me that some of the ideas that we'll be discussing in February will give us considerable latitude. But we have to temper that with a standard that will look at whether the treatment of potential applicants is done in a fair and even-handed method and is consistent with past principles, not necessarily past requirements.

So again, let me assure you that it is our responsibility at each turn to seek legal guidance as we go down this slippery slope. Every fork in the road in this day and age, as we all know, could present a legal challenge.

**Doug Echols** (South Atlantic Conference): With all due respect to my colleagues, I think we should realize that this is a moving target. As we talk about what the potential might be for changes in the membership model for Division II, this moving target must undergo real scrutiny and must be reviewed extensively, not only for how it might unfold in the next couple of years, but how it might unfold for the future because of changes that are occurring around us.

Even though we are now federated, we don't exist in isolation. What does happen in Division I and Division III and in the NAIA, continues to impact us as a membership division. We must, I think, give attention to that. Simultaneously, institutional autonomy is extremely important.

I know that the project team will take caution as it deals with all of these issues. But I think it's very appropriate that the Membership Review project team do its work.

I commend you for what you've done so far and would ask that you look as far down the road as you can, because as we make changes, whatever they might be, they need to be the kind of changes that solidify our foundation and make us stronger as a division. We have such a good foundation now. This kind of effort is what can really undergird us as a division and make us unique and make us stronger. I commend your work.

**Mr. Bryant:** Thank you very much, Doug.

**Jose-Orlando Lopez** (American University of Puerto Rico): Even though we do appreciate very much institutional individuality, we must stress the fact that there are some equality issues that must

be addressed way beyond the individuality of each institution.

In the sponsorship and the financial aid requirement questions, you do address gender equity. But we would like to bring the attention to equity of minorities and special classes that need to be addressed on an institutional basis of the NCAA, and not only on a particular basis of each institution. I would like to underscore the issue, going to the question that was posed to the panel before.

In our case, we serve very underprivileged students. When you think of preventing an underprivileged student from making \$500 in a competition from coming into the NCAA... Sometimes that \$500 in that simple competition at a high school can make the difference in being able to go to college or not.

We do like to underscore the fact that diversity is not a matter to just be left alone. We have to take a proactive movement as an institution in the NCAA.

**Shawn Kelly** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of Nebraska at Omaha): I'm a representative to the growth review project team from the national Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

I want to reiterate that we do look at every outlook. As a current member, as a student-athlete, I would like to say that before every decision that I see come forth, we look at the current institutions that are in Division II. It is of the utmost importance to us to keep Division II strong.

Most of the preliminary review spots that we are looking at aren't affecting the majority of Division II. We're not trying to refocus Division II. It is a very, very small number of institutions that we are looking at that are going to be affected out of the hundreds of schools that are in Division II. It's a very, very small number of schools that are going to be hindered.

In order to keep student-athlete welfare of the utmost importance, from my board's standpoint, it is very important that we keep the playing field level, and this is how we are doing it.

**Karen Jones** (University of Alaska Fairbanks): I was curious, on the issue of adding sports, is there some kind of consideration for those geographically challenged institutions in Alaska and Hawaii?

**Jerry Hughes** (Central Missouri State University): We haven't discussed that at this point. Like many things we have done in the past, that will be considered. Whether we would allow waivers and so forth, we would have to look at that. But we have not discussed any of the geographical situations that might occur.

**Nathan Salant** (Gulf South Conference): This membership study and the work being done might be the most important thing that we engage in the next few years, possibly the next decade, because there is the potential for a dramatic change in the face of Division II.

Consider this for a moment: Fifty Division III schools choosing to come into Division II, not because they want to start giving athletic scholarships, but because they do not wish to add one more men's and

one more women's sport. That is a significant difference, philosophically. I think that that impact has to really sink in. I'm not saying all 50 will do that. But we were told at our meeting yesterday by our Management Council rep, that that number is something like 52 or 53 schools.

For those conferences like ours that have a significant number of football-playing schools, the addition of "X" number of non-NCAA institutions to Division II, plus the potential for a great many Division III schools coming down, changes the percentages even more negatively for football. While I realize many schools do not have the sport, for those that do, this is a very, very crucial issue. I think that the committee needs to keep a very careful eye on that, because at some point in time, dollars and cents, number of student-athletes, may come to loggerheads with each other.

I think that we should be told the number of current Division II member institutions that do not sponsor either four and six, or five and five. I believe that number is available, is it not, Clint? We saw numbers at the commissioners meeting in December. I don't know whether those have been put out to the membership or not, but I believe it's a very small number. Of course, there would be an exception for the single-sex athletic program institutions like Mississippi University for Women, which is in our conference.

**Jim Johnson** (NCAA Staff): No, it hasn't been distributed to the membership. But we know that there are 52 schools that sponsor less than five men's sports and 43 schools that sponsor less than five women's sports. But there is no way to draw from that who sponsors four and six, so we don't have that information.

**Mr. Salant:** I think that's something that's important, that really needs to be out there, or that at least needs to have a good look taken at.

I also think that another real issue here is how diverse can Division II get before it starts to run into problems within itself? I don't know the answer to that. But again, I can only bring to you the concern that an institution that only sponsors men's and women's soccer, men's and women's basketball, men and women's tennis, and men's and women's golf, is very different from an institution that sponsors football, men's and women's soccer, men's and women's cross country, volleyball, men's and women's basketball, baseball, softball, et cetera. At some point, that diversity has to be seriously looked at.

That's the concern we bring as a conference. We ask the committee to take a very hard look at that, because we are suffering in football. We stand to further suffer in other sports, as well, if a low minimum standard is allowed to be set. Thank you.

**Peter Chapman** (Missouri Western State College): Not to argue whether or not we should progress with the overall picture, but just to bring to the attention of the group that when you start to study sport sponsorship, we're an institution that's going to be affected by any increase in sport sponsorship, because we have the minimum

level that we have.

I'd just like for you to keep in your thinking, if we start talking about an increase in sport, we're already going through it because of a lot of different reasons. We need to do it. We have some gender issues that we need to take care of.

I know it would become our problem if it were passed. If the group decided to go to five and five, for us to add a men's sport — while we're trying to gain gender equity — would be a very difficult thing to do. Instead of adding five sports to get to where we need to get to if membership required us to get to an additional men's sport, we probably would have to have maybe seven sports instead of the five that we have to take care of that gender-equity issue.

When you consider those types of things, we wouldn't be opposed to expansion of our sponsorship, but the gender situation, we would hope, would be considered.

**Mr. Hughes:** Yes, Pete, as I mentioned earlier, I think the committee is very sensitive to that. Because we are currently at four and four, if we did increase sport sponsorship as a recommendation to be voted on by the membership, I think it would probably be a profile, where it would be — which possibly would go to Dave's question — four men's, and a total of 10...

**Mr. Chapman:** We wouldn't be opposed to 12.

**Mr. Hughes:** Or if we went to 12, it would be four men's, and a total of 12, as a minimum. That would keep an institution that currently has four, which, as we saw, is virtually everybody except for a couple of provisional members, from encountering a gender-equity problem on their campus.

Additionally, we might have with any of these initiatives that advance forward a three-, four- or maybe five-year window before the legislation would become effective. So for example, if we were able to advance legislation to the January 2002 Convention, the effective date might not be until 2005 or 2006, which would give institutions an opportunity to gear up or do the things that they have to do politically on their campus to add sports.

**Mr. Chapman:** Thank you.

**Mr. Bryant:** I'm sorry we didn't get to the deregulation issue.

Streamlining and simplifying the Manual is critical for our division. Budgets are tight in Division II. We can't expect our limited staff to monitor complex compliance issues and understand sophisticated regulatory schemes.

Division II must continue down the path of trust we started last year. Division II must get out of the business of establishing rules and restrictions for everyone when abuses exist at only a limited number of schools. We don't need rules to cover issues that should really be addressed through waivers and appeals.

I ask that you go over the deregulation package and attend our interpretation desk if you want further interpretations. I know a lot of this has been discussed in conference meetings. Jim Johnson of



membership services will be available. Paul Echols, the chair of our Legislation Committee, will also be available to answer any questions that you might have about the deregulation package.

One of our things in our strategic plan was to deregulate. We, in Division II, have started the process. I don't know if it will be a slam-dunk like it was last year, but I know that we are headed down the road to deregulating our Manual, which is essential to what we are doing in Division II.

If I could, I would like to thank you for your attendance and active participation today. I would also like to thank all of the speakers and panelists for a job, I think, that was very well done. I have a few reminders before I let you go.

The opening business session will start at 4 p.m. this afternoon in the Southern Hemisphere 1, 2 and 3. The Honors Dinner is tonight at 7 p.m. in the Swan Ballroom, which is in the Swan Hotel. I think you will be very proud to know that one of the speakers on behalf of the Top VIII winners will be a Division II student-athlete. The first time in NCAA history that that has occurred, so we can feel very proud about that. (Applause)

The Division II business session will begin tomorrow morning at 8 a.m. sharp. I appreciate your attendance. Have a great day. See you in the morning.

[The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.]



# ■ Division II Business Session

## Monday Morning, January 8, 2001

The Division II business session was called to order at 8:10 a.m., with Presidents Council Chair Gladys Styles Johnston, chancellor, University of Nebraska at Kearney, presiding.

### OPENING REMARKS

**Gladys Styles Johnston** (University of Nebraska at Kearney): Good morning. The 2001 business session of the Division II is now in session. Kindly take your seats immediately.

Thank you very much. Good morning, again, to all of you. I'm Gladys Styles Johnston, chancellor of the University of Nebraska at Kearney, and chair of the Division II Presidents Council.

I would like to welcome all of you to Orlando. Some of you might not know it, but I'm a native Floridian, having grown up in St. Petersburg, just a few miles away from here. So it's nice to be home. Because all of you are here, we have more sunshine than we've had the past few days.

[Note: General announcements were made and various delegates were introduced.]

Let me call your attention to some general announcements in our two Convention publications. I would like, throughout the meeting, to refer you to the Convention Program. On Page 14, you will find the program for today's Division II business session.

The second publication I want to mention is the 2001 Convention Official Notice, which you should have received in November. In Appendix A, the blue pages in the Official Notice, Pages 109 to 110, you will find a list of the 45 legislative proposals, and one amendment-to-amendment that will be considered during the business session.

We will attempt to follow the business session schedule as it is listed on Pages 14 and 15 of the Convention Program. We will conclude our business and adjourn this session no later than 5 p.m. today. I would ask that you return from lunch by 1 p.m., as we will begin promptly, ready to continue the afternoon session.

Today, we have a very ambitious legislative agenda to go through, so we need to be very efficient in our voting if we hope to get through all of the proposals.

Please also note that on Pages 4 and 5 of the Convention Program, there are minor corrections to some of the Division II proposals. These are technical revisions that do not alter the original intent of the sponsors.

One official procedure that we must dispense with is the need to adopt the Convention Notice and Convention Program before we

begin our business.

If we vote to accept the Convention Notice and Program, we will vote on the proposals in the order in which they appear in the publication. So if you wish to move to reorder a proposal, now is the only time for you to do so. I also want to point out that by adopting the Official Notice, you are adopting the incorporation of interpretations described in Appendix B, Pages 113 to 116, the noncontroversial amendments in Appendix C, Pages 117 to 140, and the intent-based amendments in Appendix E, Pages 167 to 169. These interpretations and amendments all have been approved by the Management Council and Presidents Council during the past 12 months. We will not discuss any of them individually unless you move to do so.

I will now ask for a motion to adopt the Official Notice and the printed program of this Convention, so that we may proceed with our work.

**Paul Englemann** (Central Missouri State University): So move. [The motion was seconded and approved.]

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** There may be motions to reorder proposals. These motions will be discussed and voted upon as they are made. Once there are no remaining motions to order, I will call for a paddle vote on the main motion as amended.

Another piece of business. Roberts Rules of Order provide that procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such legislative requirements and procedures. Several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of the Official Notice. In addition, you will find in your Official Notice several appendices in the blue pages that list procedural information that may be of assistance to you.

NCAA Convention procedures are designed to ensure fairness and equitable treatment for all members and to expedite your work as delegates. I will not take the time to explain all of the parliamentary procedures used to ensure fairness, but I will remind the delegates that we fully intend to apply these procedures throughout the business of this Convention.

There are certain procedures we employ in attempting to use our time wisely and efficiently. Let me briefly review these for you.

The first is that we will use the voting machines for roll call votes. All other votes will be handled by paddle. I will attempt to eyeball as many votes as possible, calling for a machine count only when there is doubt as to whether there is a majority. Although the delegates have a right to ask for it, I ask all delegates to refrain from calling for a machine count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issue.

I just want to add a personal comment here. Last year when we started to count, I would look out, and then we would give an official count. People think that I am the person who is counting. You will see people standing on the podium behind me and around the room. I am

watching those individuals. They indicate to me the count. So I'm not just taking lightly what is taking place. I'm just not in a position to see everything in a room of this size.

If a delegate intends to debate an issue during the business session, we ask that you be at one of the microphone locations and be prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded, or as soon as the previous speaker has concluded his or her remarks. The microphone numbers will be utilized to recognize speakers. Delegates will be limited to speak to a single motion no more than twice. I must repeat this. You are allowed to come to the microphone only twice to speak to the same motion. If I see no one at a microphone, the vote will be called as quickly as possible.

Please remember that NCAA procedures require all votes to be by paddle or electronically, not by voice or show of hands. You need to have your voting paddle and your wireless voting units with you during this session.

The voting and speaking privileges for NCAA Conventions are set forth in the NCAA legislation and are summarized in the introduction of the Official Notice. I will not repeat them here. I would ask that you identify yourselves by name and affiliation whenever you address the Convention. Those delegates wearing convention badges with ribbons are permitted to speak. Those without ribbons are visitors and may not participate, other than as observers.

Let me also review briefly the window of reconsideration opportunity. This afternoon after we complete the Presidents Council grouping, I will call for a motion to reconsider any of the proposals that have been voted on, Proposals Nos. 10 through 30. All motions to reconsider Proposals Nos. 10 through 30 must occur at the time during the window of opportunity for reconsideration for the proposals in the Presidents Council grouping. You may call for reconsideration of other proposals that are not contained in the Presidents Council grouping, up to the adjournment of this afternoon's business session.

Please note that some proposals have immediate effective dates for implementation. For such proposals, the immediate effective date must be considered first, followed by a vote on the merits of the proposal. If an immediate effective date is defeated and the proposal is adopted, the effective date is August 1, 2001.

We have a court reporter to prepare a transcript of this business session, so I would remind you again to identify yourself and your institution or affiliation whenever you speak.

## **PRESIDENTS COUNCIL REPORT**

At this time, it's my pleasure to give you the Presidents Council Report.

As the chair of the Presidents Council, I deliver to the Division II membership the 2000 Presidents Council Report. This report is only a summary of Presidents Council actions for the past year. However,

The NCAA News publishes the actual minutes of each Presidents Council meeting, thus informing you in a timely fashion of all Presidents Council actions. In 2000, those minutes appeared in the following issues of the News: April 10, July 3, October 23 and January 1.

Last January, everyone celebrated the change of the calendar, as we marked the beginning of a new century. It has also been a very special year for the Division II Presidents Council, as we have moved forward on many major initiatives.

When considering the Presidents Council meeting in 2000, I want to highlight a few of our major accomplishments.

In 2000, the Presidents Council supervised the implementation of the Division II strategic plan. Constitution 4.3.2-(c) specifies that the Division II Presidents Council has responsibility for establishing a strategic plan for Division II.

At last year's Convention, the Presidents Council unveiled the Division's three-year strategic plan. We revised the various objectives identified to accomplish specific priorities. During our first year of operation with this plan, Division II has been able to achieve specific goals that have been identified by the Division II membership. In a few minutes, Don Lubbers will provide an overview of Division II's strategic accomplishments from this past year. The strategic plan has given our division a strong cornerstone, and it will continue to guide the Presidents Council in our deliberations during meetings of this year.

The second accomplishment in 2000, the Presidents Council continued an aggressive plan to enhance Division II championships. Nearly \$1 million in Division II championship expenses were added to the Division II budget this fiscal year to address the following initiatives:

The first was Division II national championships established in women's lacrosse and women's golf. Second, the squad size and travel party size increase approved for baseball, field hockey, men's lacrosse, men's soccer, softball and women's volleyball. The third, mementos valued at \$50 per student-athlete were approved for every Division II championship. Fourth, field size increases approved for cross country, track and wrestling. This provides 256 additional championship opportunities for Division II student-athletes. Five, bracket size increases approved in field hockey, men's lacrosse and women's volleyball. This provides 320 additional championship participation opportunities for Division II student-athletes.

In 2000, the Presidents Council continued to manage the Division II budget in a financially prudent way. At the end of this fiscal year, Division II will have \$4 million in reserve funds and would have accumulated \$5 million in surplus money. The \$4 million in reserve represents 30 percent of the division's annual operating revenue. The Presidents Council believes this percentage of the annual operating revenue is the appropriate amount to allocate to a reserve fund so

that we will have adequate funds to conduct Division II championships for one year if a catastrophic financial event should occur.

The \$5 million in surplus funds will be used by Division II during the next few years to support specific Division II strategic initiatives. You will hear more information regarding the division's financial status and the Division II long-range budget plan from the Presidents Council vice chair, Bernard Franklin, in just a few minutes.

The Presidents Council also agreed to sponsor legislation that will continue to allow Division II to take a leadership role in the area of deregulation. Rule simplification and deregulation are major priorities of the Presidents Council. At last year's Convention, the delegates overwhelmingly agreed to adopt all 13 deregulation proposals that were sponsored by the Presidents Council in the area of personnel and recruiting.

This year, the delegates will have a chance to consider 13 new proposals to deregulate Bylaw 15 rules, which has to do with financial aid. I feel encouraged by our progress in making the Division II Manual more friendly and easier to manage. This common-sense approach, based on trust, to govern our membership is really truly a breath of fresh air.

The Presidents Council applauds your efforts at last year's Convention, and we encourage your support of the 13 financial aid deregulation proposals that we will consider later today.

In summary, much of the Presidents Council's time each year is spent reviewing specific recommendations from NCAA committees and managing the division's affairs between Conventions. Those matters are all reflected in the printed materials that I referenced to you previously.

It has certainly been a remarkable year for Division II. The Presidents Council is pleased with our direction. We hope that you are pleased with our leadership for Division II.

Before I end my final report as chair of the Presidents Council, I would like to take a moment to recognize the following Presidents Council members for their years of service and for their contributions to Division II. These individuals will complete their four-year terms of office on the Presidents Council following this year's Convention. I will introduce them and ask that you hold all applause until they have been introduced. First, Charles Dunn, Henderson State University; Jessica Kozloff, Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania; Skip Shannon, Saint Joseph's College; and Jerry McGee of Wingate University. Let's give them a round of applause. (Applause)

I would also like to recognize the other members of the Presidents Council who are with us today: Hazo Carter, West Virginia State University; Lawrence DeNardis, University of New Haven; Bernard Franklin, Virginia Union University; Don Lubbers, Grand Valley State University; Karen Morris, Western Washington University; Oscar Prater, Fort Valley State University; and Kay

Schallenkamp of Emporia State. Thank you.

I want to take a moment to recognize the Presidents Council new leader who will assume office in April. Patty Cormier, the chief executive officer at Longwood College, has been elected as the fourth chair of the Division II Presidents Council. We anticipate many great things from the Presidents Council next year under Patty's outstanding leadership. Patty, would you stand, please? (Applause)

It's really been an honor for me to be the chair of this division for the past two years. I have been around and involved with the NCAA since before restructuring as a member of the old Presidents Commission. I have witnessed some really tremendous changes in the Association and also in our division.

I think that the restructuring has been a tremendous asset to Division II. We have really taken charge of framing our destiny for the future. So for us, unlike some other divisions, we continue to thrive. We continue to be the shining beacon of effective leadership and management for the entire NCAA. I want all of you to give yourselves a round of applause for doing that. (Applause)

This concludes my report from the Presidents Council. If there are any issues that you have regarding actions taken by the Presidents Council this year, I would be happy to entertain any questions that you may have. If you care to speak and go to a microphone, please identify yourself. Thank you.

I'm going to ask Clint Bryant, the athletics director of Augusta State University, to give the delegates a brief report on the work of the Division II Management Council. I want to say, as Clint is moving toward the podium, that Clint has done a tremendous job as chair of the Management Council. If you take into consideration our structure, while we, the presidents, like to feel that we are providing the leadership, the really hard work of Division II is conducted by the Management Council. Ultimately, it takes the approval of the Presidents Council to move things forward. Under Clint's leadership, all of the deregulation things that have taken place, and one of the key cornerstone pieces of legislation in the history of Division II, amateurism, is going to be voted on today.

I personally want to take this opportunity, Clint, to say thank you very much for a job well done. (Applause)

## **MANAGEMENT COUNCIL REPORT**

**Clint Bryant** (Augusta State University): Good morning. As chair of the Division II Management Council, I'm pleased to stand before you this morning to report on the accomplishments of the Division II Management Council.

Before I deliver my report, I would like to recognize the tireless volunteers who served us all in the Division II membership and management governance structure.

First of all, I would like to recognize individuals who served as members of Division II committees. Anyone who has served on a



Division II committee, would you stand and please be recognized at this time? If you served on any Division II committee, please stand and be recognized. Join me in congratulating these people. (Applause)

I would like to give special recognition to a special group of young people who really exemplify why we do what we do, and that's the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Would they stand, please, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Let's give them a hand. (Applause)

For those of you who had the opportunity to be at the Honors Dinner last night, Kevin Listerman, a fine young man from Northern Kentucky, is a product of that committee.

I would also like to recognize those members of the Division II Presidents Council. I'm not going to ask you to stand, because I know Dr. Johnston just did that. But I want you to know, on behalf of the Management Council, we really, really respect the job and leadership that you have provided for us.

Now, the members of the Division II Management Council, if you would please stand and be recognized. Join me in recognizing them. (Applause)

I did this yesterday in the Issues Forum, but I would like to do it again. I would like to have special recognition for Jean Bell Chandler from Clark Atlanta University, who passed on October 31. She was the senior woman administrator and also the acting athletics director. She was a very special lady, and she will truly be missed in our division.

I also at this time would like to say that there's going to be outstanding leadership as far as the chairmanship of Management Council, which is in the very capable hands of my good friend Jerry Hughes of Central Missouri State.

Jerry, I know Division II is going to be in great shape with you and your leadership, because you have the experience and know-how to make sure that we stay on task for the things we need to do.

Now I'll go into my report. Some highlights from the past year include consideration and debate on a variety of issues that have resulted in legislative proposals that the membership will have a chance to vote on today.

Amateurism and deregulation are major priorities in the Division II strategic plan. Division II delegates will have an opportunity today to change the way we regulate precollege amateurism restrictions and Division II financial aid legislation.

As you heard President Dempsey mention in his remarks yesterday, Division II is leading the way in both of these important areas. A lot of people are watching with interest the decisions we will make later on today.

Quickly, let me highlight some of the major Management Council accomplishments in the Year 2000. Like Chancellor Johnston mentioned, the Presidents Council and the Division II Management

Council minutes can be found in the following issues of the News: April 10, July 3, October 23 and January 1.

The first thing I would like to talk about is our strategic plan. The Division II strategic plan continues to provide guidance and direction for the work of the Management Council and the Presidents Council. Perhaps our biggest accomplishment this year will be developing a long-range budget for Division II that provides resources for the various initiatives set forth in the strategic plan. This financial blueprint truly brings the Division II strategic plan to light. Later this morning, you will hear more information regarding the division's long-range budget plan.

The diversity plan. The Division II Management Council has worked with the Division II Presidents Council to develop a grant program to enhance the diversity of athletics administrators on Division II campuses and conference offices. Division II has taken a bold step in our approach to address gender/ethnic diversity issues. The Management Council and the Presidents Council are committed to this proposal. The other two divisions are monitoring our success.

This year, 250,000 in grant dollars were awarded to the following six institutions and one conference to enhance minority and female representation among Division II athletics administrators. Those institutions were: California State University, Dominguez Hills; the University of New Haven; Emporia State University; University of South Carolina, Aiken; Humboldt State University; University of Nebraska at Kearney; and the California Collegiate Athletic Association. I would like to congratulate those who have participated in the program. I had the opportunity several days ago to meet those individuals. I can tell you, we're going to be very, very proud of that program.

In Division II compliance, the Division II Management Council and Presidents Council have approved a new Division II compliance assistance tool to active member schools entitled Division II Compliance Blueprint Program. Hopefully, some of you learned about this new Division II resource during Saturday's Convention education sessions.

The objective of the program is to assist Division II institutions to evaluate the current compliance program and to create a blueprint to enhance compliance efforts on our institutional campuses. This program is voluntary, and it's provided by the NCAA at no cost to Division II active members. I hope many schools will take advantage of this outstanding service, and do it as quickly as possible.

In regard to the moratorium, last spring, a membership moratorium was adopted in all three divisions to permit each division to engage in a comprehensive review of current divisional membership requirements and determine whether changes are needed. The reason for this moratorium, and the decision to establish a project team to review Division II membership issues, included: significant Division II membership growth since the inception of the provisional

membership in 1994; second, interest by the Management Council and Presidents Council to review the Division II philosophy statement and current legislation to ensure all Division II members are committed to a similar philosophy and mission for intercollegiate athletics; and last, in order to be proactive, Division II must develop a plan to initiate systematic and manageable growth for the division after the moratorium is lifted.

It is anticipated that the project team reviewing this issue will complete its work during the next six months, and the moratorium will be lifted following next year's Convention.

**Amateurism.** Later this morning, all of us will have a chance to vote on the most significant Division II legislation proposal since the 1996 NCAA Convention in Dallas. That is where we established a new Division II structure.

Today's debate will represent two years of work on this topic by the Division II Amateurism Project Team. This project team has stayed focused on the real issues facing our division. They have not strayed into the business of hypotheticals and "what ifs." The project team is committed to the success of this legislation, and the group has agreed to stay together for the next 12 months to monitor the impact of the rules changes.

I'm excited about the possibility of conducting Division II athletics with amateurism rules that will be easy to understand, simple to monitor and consistently applied to both domestic and international athletes. The Management Council has unanimously supported this legislative proposal, and I encourage your enthusiastic support of this legislation when we consider it later on this morning.

**Deregulation.** Last year, 13 deregulation proposals were sponsored by the membership for consideration, and 13 were adopted by the Division II delegates. I like to refer to it as a slam-dunk.

This year, there are 13 new proposals that will modify Bylaw 15 rules — financial aid legislation. I have faith that the membership is ready to once again bat 100 percent in our deregulation efforts as we try to move toward a common, central approach to regulatory compliance. The Management Council encourages your support when these Bylaw 15 proposals are considered later today.

Next year, Division II will be considering deregulation of Bylaw 17 rules that cover playing and practice seasons.

At this time, I would like to ask Paul Engelmann from Central Missouri State University to come forth to deliver a brief preview of next year's Bylaw 17 deregulation project.

**Paul Engelmann** (Central Missouri State University): I'm faculty athletics representative at Central Missouri State University, and serve as chair for the Legislation Committee. My task this morning is to provide you with a brief update on the Division II deregulation project.

The project, as you know, was established as a priority for the Division II membership by the Presidents Council and was incorpo-

rated in the Division II strategic plan.

Today, you are considering proposals that represent the finished product of the second phase of the project. Those are the 13 proposals sponsored by the Presidents Council to deregulate Bylaw 15. The committee recently completed work on initial recommendations to deregulate Bylaw 17 — playing and practice seasons. Those concepts were reviewed by the Management Council and Presidents Council at their pre-Convention meetings.

Work will begin this summer on discussion of concepts to deregulate and simplify eligibility legislation in Bylaw 14.

As I stated in San Diego a year ago, the committee has focused on three goals as we have worked our way through the first three years of the deregulation effort. I would like to briefly review each of these goals with you.

First, simplify the application and understanding of Division II legislation. Second, reduce the amount of legislation included in the Division II Manual by eliminating legislation that is not consistent with the Division II philosophy or not necessary in Division II. Third, simplify and/or reduce the monitoring activities that are necessary due to current legislation.

In keeping with these goals, the 13 proposals before you today significantly deregulate financial aid legislation. The committee hopes that you share our belief that today is, again, a landmark day in Division II. Although there may well be more skepticism regarding financial aid proposals than you felt a year ago when considering recruiting and personnel, the committee, along with both Councils, agrees that these proposals still represent the goals of deregulation and do not enable institutions to gain significant advantages. Conversely, these proposals attempt to level the playing field in relation to understanding and accurately applying financial aid rules.

Today, Division II can once again clearly demonstrate our belief in legislative autonomy and at the same time continue to lead the Association as a whole in deregulating the NCAA Manual.

In placing your vote today, please keep in mind that what the committee has attempted to do is obtain efficiency in Division II legislation. Sometimes this can be interpreted as coming at the expense of equity, which may be a concern you will hear in relation to some of the financial aid proposals.

However, as you will hear on the floor several times today, it is time for Division II to strive for efficiency by adopting legislation. It is impossible to adopt legislation that is equitable to every institution in every circumstance. Therefore, we should take every opportunity to adopt legislation that reinforces Division II philosophy, makes rules compliance an easier task and enables institutions to operate on that level playing field, as opposed to retaining legislation that is often interpreted many ways by different institutions, which many times also has the effect of inequity.

This past July, the third deregulation summit was held to discuss

playing and practice seasons. Participants represented the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, the Division II Athletic Directors Association the National Association of Athletics Compliance Coordinators, the Division II Commissioners Association and coaches representing 12 of the 18 sports in which Division II conducts championships.

In November, the committee met and using the input from the summit discussed several concepts for Bylaw 17 deregulation. I would like to briefly share these with you.

One, eliminate the 20-hour-per-week-per-sport limitation for multiple-sport athletes. Countable athletically related activities would be limited to a total of 20 hours per week. Two, eliminate the list of contest exemptions in each section of Bylaw 17 and create two master lists in the front of Bylaw 17. One list would contain automatic annual exemptions, and one list would contain discretionary annual exemptions. Each sport would be limited to three discretionary exemptions each year. Three, eliminate the requirement that skill instruction must be requested by the student-athlete. We think it's a fiction and time has come to eliminate it. Four, eliminate legislation governing emerging sports from the Manual and create an emerging sport handbook on the NCAA Web site. This will not amend any existing legislation. It will simply relocate existing legislation. The legislation currently occupies about 35 pages in the Division II Manual. The five emerging sports are currently sponsored by a total of two Division II institutions. Five, amend the definition of "countable athletically related activities" so that it is an all-inclusive list, and eliminate the list of activities that are currently considered countable. Six, eliminate the prohibition against intrasquad off-campus scrimmages. Seven, amend legislation so that scrimmages count as the actual time they occupy, rather than simply counting as a fixed three hours, as is regular competition. Eight, redefine playing and practice season requirements for fall and spring team sports so that there is a consistent start date for practice for both segments, a consistent start date for competition during the championship segment a consistent end date for both segments, a maximum number of days for participation during the nonchampionship segment, and a consistent number of contests and/or dates of competition during the non-championship segment.

It's important to note that the committee is continuing to discuss a similar model for individual sports. This concept does not affect basketball, ice hockey or any team sport in which the only championship opportunity is a National Collegiate Championship.

The committee wants to emphasize that this concept is in its infancy stage, and there are certainly many issues to be worked out prior to legislation being proposed by the September 1 deadline.

In fact, please understand that all of these concepts are still in the discussion phase, and we invite and encourage your input. Discussion on these and other ideas will continue throughout the

spring and will be before you in legislative form in January 2002 in Indianapolis.

Please take the time to complete the deregulation suggestion sheets on your table, and forward these to the national office. Suggestions may be related to Bylaw 17 or any other bylaws that we will be deregulating in the future. The committee sincerely needs and wants your input.

In closing, I would like to thank my colleagues who served on the Legislation Committee. I would like to recognize them for their hard work and dedication on this project and their efforts in conducting the other business of the committee. Would the members of the committee please stand? Thank you. (Applause)

In particular, I would like to recognize three individuals who are now going off the committee. They have completed their terms. We appreciate all their hard work and efforts on your behalf and our behalf. Specifically, Janet Degginger, Lisa Colvin and Pam Gill-Fisher. Would you please stand and be recognized? Thank you. (Applause)

**Clint Bryant** (Augusta State University): Thank you, Paul.

I'm one who is very excited about the direction of Division II. It's a very exciting time in Division II. Unlike on a number of our campuses, for the next several years, I think 12 years, we know exactly what our resources will be. It will provide us an opportunity to do some things that are going to really put us on the cutting edge of this new millennium.

It's been a tremendous experience for me to serve in this capacity. I would like at this time to thank Mike Racy and Jan Brown and the staff at the NCAA for the outstanding job they do on behalf of the Division II membership. I think sometimes we take for granted the services that they provide. But I can guarantee you, after working with Mike Racy for the past two years so closely, he does an outstanding job. We in the Division II membership are indebted for his services. So join me in thanking Mike. (Applause)

I wouldn't be able to do what I do if it wasn't for the members of my conference, the Peach Belt Conference, and the tremendous leadership under Commissioner Marvin Vanover, people at Augusta State University, and Dr. William A. Bloodworth for allowing me to serve in this capacity.

I can sincerely say that my life has been truly enriched, and I am forever grateful for being blessed with the opportunity to serve in this capacity. With that, Chancellor Johnston, that concludes my final report on behalf of the Management Council. (Applause)

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** Thank you very much, Clint.

The next thing I'd like to talk about, are some activities that are coming up. I would like to refer you to noncontroversial amendment No. 4 on Page 119 of your Convention Notice. It features the elimination of the requirement that the Management Council representatives be ratified by the entire membership at the annual NCAA

Convention. The Management Council and Presidents Council have agreed that this tradition, carried over from the old structure, is not necessary for our new conference representative model on the Division II Management Council.

The Management Council and Presidents Council do agree, however, that the ceremony of identifying new Management Council and Presidents Council representatives recently elected to terms of office should continue during the annual Division II business session.

This morning, you should have received an updated roster. It's a pink and green handout for the Division II Management Council and Presidents Council.

I would like to ask the following new representatives to please stand and be recognized. New members of the Presidents Council are as follows: From the Great Lakes Valley Conference, John Keating, University of Wisconsin, Parkside; the North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, Nancy Belck, University of Nebraska at Omaha; the Peach Belt Conference, Frank D. Brown, Columbus State University; the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference, W. Clinton Pettus, Cheyney University of Pennsylvania.

The new Management Council representatives are as follows: New York Collegiate Conference, Clyde Doughty, athletics director from the New York Institute of Technology; the Peach Belt Conference, Richard E. Gropper, athletics director, University of North Florida; the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference, Joan McDermott, senior woman administrator, Metropolitan State College of Denver, Joan isn't in attendance today; West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, George Klebez, athletics director, West Virginia Wesleyan College.

Let's give a round of applause to these representatives. (Applause)

At this time, I'm going to ask Bernard Franklin, the chair of the Budget and Finance Committee, to give us a report on the status of the budget for the division.

## **BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

**Bernard Franklin** (Virginia Union University): Good morning. I serve as chair, and I'm speaking on behalf of the Division II Budget and Finance Committee.

The Division II Budget and Finance Committee reports to the Division II Presidents Council and the Division II Management Council.

The Division II Budget and Finance Committee for 2001 is comprised of the following individuals: Hazo W. Carter, Jr., West Virginia State College; Lisa Colvin, Southern Arkansas University; Patricia Cormier, Longwood College; myself as chair, from Virginia Union University; Gail Fults from Humboldt State University; Jerry Hughes from Central Missouri State University; Gladys Styles Johnston from the University of Nebraska at Kearney; Arend Don

Lubbers from Grand Valley State University; and Mike Marcil from the North Central Conference.

The Budget and Finance Committee has adopted 10 budget principles to guide Division II budget deliberations and recommendations. These guidelines are reflective of Division II philosophy and NCAA principles.

Changes and additions to the principles in 2000 included:

One, the Membership Trust Reserve maintain a balance of 30 percent of the annual Division II operating budget. The committee decided that this 30 percent reserve would allow Division II to support itself if a catastrophic financial event occurred. There was not a goal amount set for the membership trust prior to this year. Two, that the use of the annual operating surpluses, that being unallocated funds from the previous fiscal year, will be discussed each year at the Budget and Finance Committee's winter meeting. And third, that budget decisions will be made to support the initiatives outlined in the Division II strategic plan.

Now, to review Division II's 1999-2000 financial results.

- Division II revenue allocation totalled \$14.7 million for the 1999-00 fiscal year.
- \$6.8 million was spent for Division II championships, an increase of 10 percent, or \$613,000, from the previous year. The increase is mainly attributed to an increase in travel costs and the per diem increase from \$60 per day to \$65 per day.
- \$3 million was distributed as a Division II enhancement fund to the Division II membership.
- \$932,000 was contributed to the Division II membership trust.
- \$287,000 was dispersed for the Division II strategic alliance matching grant program and other miscellaneous expenses.
- The remaining \$3.7 million was not allocated to a specific Division II program during the 1999-2000 year and is available for use in 2000-01.

The Division II membership trust has accumulated \$2.2 million over the past three years. As mentioned earlier, it was decided this year that the target amount for the membership trust should be set at 30 percent of the division's annual allocation. Beginning with 2000-01, and each year thereafter, money will be set aside so that the membership trust equals 30 percent of the division's revenue allocation.

In terms of unallocated funds, the actual Division II unallocated funds have accumulated to \$6.9 million over the past three years. The Division II Budget and Finance Committee had decided during the 1998-99 fiscal year to be conservative in regard to the use of the unallocated funds to ensure that Division II will continue its strong operations. However, this year, upon completion of the new CBS contract, the Budget and Finance Committee developed and recommended a long-range financial plan for Division II that aligns Division II financial resources with the Division II strategic plan initiatives. President



Don Lubbers and I will address the highlights of the plan in a few moments.

I would like to review with you the 2000-2001 budget, as approved in August of 2000.

- Division II revenue is at \$13.7 million.
- Division II expenses. Championship expenses, \$9.1 million.
- Division II enhancement fund, \$3 million.
- Addition to Division II membership trust, \$2 million.
- Division II diversity matching grant program, \$250,000.
- The deregulation summit, \$15,000.
- Contingency fund, \$100,000.
- The total for Division II expenses, \$14.4 million.
- Previous year unallocated funds were \$6.9 million. The 2000-01 Division II projected unallocated funds is at \$6.2 million.

You may see that the operating budget for 2001 is at a \$700,000 deficit. The division is using previous year's unallocated or surplus funds to get the membership trust balance to 30 percent of the division's 2001 revenue allocation, per the Division II's budget guidelines.

New in 2000-01 is the enhancement fund. The 2000-01 fiscal year will be the implementation year for the new enhancement fund distribution formula. This first year is used as a tracking period for the following year's distribution. The new distribution model for Division II includes: One-third of the fund distributed equally to Division II active institutions; one-third of the fund distributed to Division II conferences, based on performance in the Division II men's and women's basketball championships; and one-third of the fund distributed to Division II conferences, based on the number of championships that conference sponsors. These funds based on the new distribution formula will be distributed in May 2002.

A final observations on the financial position of Division II: The governance structure provides us many opportunities for Division II to enrich our student-athletes and the service that can be provided to our membership. The Presidents Council believes that it is crucial to study the issues and alternatives so that Division II provides prudent stewardship of its resources.

Finally, feedback regarding any Division II financial issue is welcome. Please feel free to contact me or any of the Budget and Finance Committee members.

Now, on to our long-range financial plan. The Division II Budget and Finance Committee recommended in July a long-range financial plan for Division II. This plan mirrors the division's strategic plan, which emphasizes student-athlete welfare, championships and diversity. The division's conferences will be key partners in carrying out the specifics of the long-range financial plan.

The revenue projections for Division II will climb from \$13.7 million in 2000-01 to \$20.6 million in 2004-05. The reason for the large increase is the new CBS contract that the NCAA negotiated in 1999-

2000. The new contract begins in the 2002-03 fiscal year.

The plan includes inflationary increases for championship expenses of approximately 5 percent each year. Without any championship expansions, the championship expenses are projected to increase from \$9.1 million in 2000-01 to \$11 million in 2004-05.

An increase to the enhancement fund distribution is also included in the plan. With the long-range plan, the fund is scheduled to increase incrementally from the current \$3 million to \$4.5 million in 2004-05. This fund is designed to provide conference offices with additional dollars to enhance conference operations. It is hoped that conferences will use such dollars to address some of the priorities and objectives identified in Division II's strategic plan.

The strategic alliance grant program to assist conferences and institutions to enhancing the diversity of Division II athletic administrators is slated to increase from the current \$250,000 funding to \$500,000 in 2002-03.

With these projected increases, the projected expenses for Division II will grow from the current \$14.3 million to \$16.5 million in 2004-05.

Cumulative unallocated dollars will continue to grow from the current \$6.2 million to an estimated \$15.6 million in 2004-05. These unallocated funds will be used to fund budget initiatives that support the division's strategic plan.

Copies of the Division II long-range financial plan are at the back of the room. Please take one copy per institution. Let a member of the governance structure know of any comments or questions you may have.

President Lubbers will now discuss the division's strategic plan and new budget initiatives that support the plan.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** Before Don takes the podium, I would like to recognize him as the former chair of our division.

You were the first person to chair this strategic planning effort that we had for the division. Don, I would like to compliment you on your leadership and for the very outstanding, stellar job that you did in getting us through this event.

Don is also going to be retiring as president of Grand Valley State University at the end of this academic year.

Don, since this will be your last official role as a member of the Presidents Council, on behalf of all of us, we would like to say thank you very much for a job well done. (Applause)

## **DIVISION II STRATEGIC PLAN**

**Arend D. Lubbers** (Grand Valley State University): Thank you, Gladys, and thank you, Bernard.

At last year's Convention, I had the opportunity to introduce to you the Division II strategic plan. The plan has served us well and has guided the division's leadership in its policy making.

I would like now to take a few minutes to highlight the accom-

plishments of the division in the past year and identify future initiatives, as outlined in the long-range financial plan.

The Division II Management Council and Presidents Council are accountable for initiatives identified under the strategic plan. This past year, we were able to make great inroads into that plan.

Under the objective of enhancing the student-athletes' championship experience, championship mementos valued at \$50 are given at all Division II championships. At individual-team championships, NCAA awards are given to the top eight finishers.

To enhance the student-athletes' role in the governance structure, the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, which I'll refer to as SAAC in the future, developed a legislative grid of Convention proposals and distributed this grid to all campus SAACs in order to receive feedback regarding the proposed legislation.

Also, the term limits and eligibility requirements of the national SAAC were amended to assist in providing more effective communication at the national, conference and institutional level.

Under the objective of reviewing academic requirements, the division has embarked on a study to evaluate the academic success of transfer student-athletes in Division II. Also, a Division II degree-completion scholarship fund was established.

Finally, in the area of student-athlete welfare, to promote a better understanding of the Division II student-athlete, the national SAAC distributed the division facts and figures sheet to each campus SAAC.

At this time, I would like to recognize the work of the Division II SAAC. The student-athletes, in addition to attending classes, competing and serving on their respective conference SAACs, have accomplished an extraordinary amount of work on behalf of Division II student-athletes this past year. Congratulations to you.

Under the priority of championships, the division has made significant enhancements. Bracket and field sizes have been increased in men's and women's cross country, field hockey, men's lacrosse, men's and women's indoor and outdoor track and field, women's volleyball, and wrestling.

Squad and travel party sizes have been increased in baseball, field hockey, men's lacrosse, men's and women's soccer, softball, and women's volleyball.

Division II also established two new championships in women's golf and women's lacrosse.

Finally, a plan has been approved to increase bracket sizes in women's softball, women's soccer and men's and women's basketball in the next four years. I think we increased to 64 teams in basketball.

In the area of Division II finances, you just heard President Franklin speak about the changes to the reserve fund, the enhancement fund and the long-range financial plan. As part of the long-range budget planning, the Membership Review Project Team was established to review current Division II membership requirements

and consider the impact of membership growth on current Division II active members.

Division II is a leader in the area of deregulation. Thirteen proposals were adopted at last year's Convention to deregulate Bylaws 11 and 13. This year, the Division II membership will consider 13 proposals to deregulate Bylaw 15.

Later on today, you will hear from the Legislation Committee on the concepts developed as a result of the 2000 deregulation summit, which focused on Bylaw 17.

To promote the Division II identity, the Division II facts and figures sheet were finalized and distributed to the membership. This document summarizes what makes Division II schools different from the other divisions.

In the area of compliance, a new Division II compliance blueprint program has been approved to address the specific compliance needs unique to Division II institutions. In the area of diversity, I'm happy to announce that in the first year of the strategic alliance matching grant enhancement program, six institutions and one conference office were awarded grants out of \$250,000 available. We had 24 applications submitted for money, totalling over \$1 million. It is clear that this program will be a success. The other divisions are already planning to implement similar programs.

In a few minutes, we will have the opportunity to redefine amateurism in Division II. For the past 18 months, the Amateurism Project Team has studied this issue and discussed with the membership the problems related to our present legislation.

The legislation that is before us today addresses these concerns and moves us in the direction of ensuring competitive equity among Division II institutions and the fair treatment of all Division II student-athletes.

The last Division II accomplishment I would like to share with you is in the area of technology and communication. The NCAA is currently redesigning its Web site. As part of this process, there will be specific links for the Division II membership, including a Division II SAAC Web site.

As you can tell, 2000 was an historical year for Division II. Our accomplishments are significant, and the strategic plan will guide us to new accomplishments in the next years.

I would now like to talk about the strategic initiatives identified in the long-range financial plan. As President Franklin mentioned earlier, these initiatives support Division II's strategic plan during the next four years. These initiatives will attempt to use the division's unallocated surplus dollars in a way that addresses specific priorities in the strategic plan.

The long-range budget plan establishes new Division II championships and programs administered by the national office, as well as enhances current NCAA programs and championships. It enhances conference office operations so that conferences may administer

strategic plan initiatives, and it holds conferences accountable for these initiatives. It also increases the Division II enhancement fund.

To support the strategic plan priorities of championships and student-athlete welfare, \$1.6 million tentatively has been approved for new championship initiatives, and \$650,000 has been approved to be used for championship per diem increases.

I might state that the Budget Committee was cognizant of the membership's priority on championships. Much was discussed about it. The per diem was of great concern, as well as additional championships and bracket increases. In fact, in President Franklin's report, you'll notice \$1.9 million has been added for these initiatives.

In addition, the Budget Committee and the Presidents Council have asked the Championship Committee to put a plan in place to evaluate championship expenses. As you can see, there is a considerable surplus. If there is a greater need for funding in championships, I think the Presidents Council and the Budget Committee is ready to give careful consideration to that as one of the Association's and the division's top priorities. I think you'll see more planning and more interest in the funding of championships in the next year. But we wanted to move quite cautiously to see that we did it right.

To support the strategic plan priorities of student-athlete welfare and diversity, \$100,000 has been approved to establish a Division II degree completion program; \$50,000 has been approved as a contribution to the NCAA fellows program for inclusion of Division II administrators; and a \$250,000 increase has been approved toward the division's diversity grant program, making the total for that program \$500,000 each year.

To support the strategic plan priorities of technology/communications and the Division II's identity, \$100,000 has been approved to develop a Division II specific Web site, which includes a Division II student-athlete link; and \$50,000 has been approved to create Division II public service announcements.

A key feature of Division II's long-range budget plan is the conference plan. The Presidents Council approved allocation of Division II revenue to Division II conferences to address priorities identified in the strategic plan because it believes conference offices are the appropriate group to implement some of the division's strategic initiatives. The Presidents Council believes that the conference offices should be held accountable for funds allocated to them, so an important aspect of the plan is accountability.

Money will be distributed to conference offices every year to implement and maintain programs and services in the areas of diversity, enhancing the role of the senior woman administrator and faculty athletics representatives; enhancing conference SAACs; implementing academic support programs; improving technology; and developing student-athlete financial assistance.

Access to the money will be made available only to conferences and independent institutions eligible for Division II enhancement

fund distributions. It will be the responsibility of the Division II Budget and Finance Committee to oversee the overall program.

Conferences will have reasonable flexibility in designing programs to fit the needs of their conference institutions. Money may be used to enhance existing programs or implement new ones.

Consortium will be allowed so that conferences may pool their resources to create one program. Conferences may also allocate a portion of the fund to a member institution.

As I mentioned earlier, conferences will be held accountable under this plan. Funds must be requested annually, and the conference must use the entire grant each year. The NCAA reserves the right to seek reimbursement of unused funds or funds misappropriated.

Finally, conferences must submit annual reports to the Division II Budget and Finance Committee that summarize their expenses prior to the disbursement of future funds.

The information I have quickly summarized regarding the Division II Conference Plan is detailed in the long-range budget plan that Dr. Franklin referenced earlier. Again, these plans are located on tables in the back of the ballroom. Please limit copies to one per school or conference.

As Dr. Franklin also mentioned, one of the long-range strategic initiatives is to increase the Division II enhancement fund from \$3 million to \$4.5 million over the next four years, to give schools and conferences increased revenue for the first time since the enhancement fund was implemented.

It is the hope of the Management Council and the Presidents Council that these additional funds will be used to enhance conference office operations so that conference offices will be equipped to implement the strategic initiatives that I just reviewed, which are targeted for conference office implementation.

I invite you to take a look at the long-range financial plan and contact any member of the Budget and Finance Committee with your questions and comments. Thank you. (Applause)

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** Thank you very much, Don, and also, Bernard, for the reports.

I would like to take a few minutes at this time to go over some voting instructions with you.

[Note: Electronic voting instructions were given.]

May I have your attention, please? It appears from all the technicians in the room that the voting machines are operating properly. However, if anyone has any questions, you may go and speak to any of the individuals who I previously identified. This is now a wonderful time to take a 10-minute break, and it will give the technicians an opportunity to deal with any potential technical difficulties.

[Note: The meeting was recessed for 10 minutes.]

## RESOLUTIONS

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** The meeting is reconvened. I would appreciate it if you'd kindly take your seats now.

I would like to recognize the speaker at Microphone No. 6.

**Patricia Cormier** (Longwood College): Thank you.

On behalf of the Presidents Council, I offer to this Convention a resolution for Gladys Styles Johnston.

*Whereas*, Gladys Styles Johnston will conclude her term as chair of the NCAA Division II Presidents Council at the conclusion of the 2001 Convention; and

*Whereas*, Gladys Styles Johnston has made significant contributions to the Division II Presidents Council, Executive Committee and the NCAA Division II membership; and

*Whereas*, Gladys Styles Johnston has served as chair of the Division II Presidents Council, and in that capacity, chair of the Administrative Committee, and has provided leadership and demonstrated strength of character, understanding and flexibility while working to increase the involvement of Division II chief executive officers in the NCAA structure; and

*Whereas*, Gladys Styles Johnston's service on the Executive Committee has included service on the Executive Committee Budget Subcommittee and as chair of the Executive Committee Subcommittee to Review Issues Related to Gender and Diversity;

*Now, therefore, be it resolved*, that the Division II membership wishes to express our deepest appreciation to Gladys Styles Johnston for her hard work, her passion, and her dedication to the growth and to the success of Division II.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** Thank you. (Applause and standing ovation)

Thank you all very, very much. I truly did not expect this. I've been very proud to represent you in the governance of this Association. Also, I am proud to have made so many new friends and colleagues all across the country. Thank you very much again.

**Jerry Hughes** (Central Missouri State University): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to offer the following resolution on behalf of Clint Bryant.

*Whereas*, the term of office of the NCAA Division II Management Council for Clint Bryant will expire at the conclusion of the 2001 Convention; and

*Whereas*, Clint Bryant has made significant contributions to the Division II Management Council and the NCAA Division II membership; and

*Whereas*, Clint Bryant has served remarkably as chair of the Management Council for the past two years and, in that capacity, has been an active member of the Administrative Committee, the Budget and Finance Committee, the Amateurism Project Team, the Membership Review Project Team, and chair of the Project Team to

Review Issues Related to Diversity; and

*Whereas*, Clint Bryant has been a wise and astute counselor to the Academic Requirements, Championships, Legislation, Membership, Nominating, Student-Athlete Reinstatement and Student-Athlete Advisory Committees;

*Now, therefore, be it resolved*, that Clint Bryant has demonstrated leadership and vision in helping to guide NCAA Division II into the 21st century and will be greatly missed as a member of the Division II Management Council and as a leader of the NCAA.

Thank you. (Applause)

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** Clint had to leave the room to take a telephone call. He will be very grateful. When he comes into the room and we start applauding, he won't know what it was for. Somebody can tell him that he was really well recognized at this Convention. So on behalf of the Presidents Council and the Management Council, I just want to thank you for your remembrance of Clint.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Now we're ready for the main task for today. We'll convene with our voting.

I'm going to ask that we begin our official voting. We will start on Page 2 of the Official Notice and consent package Proposals 1 through 9.

As we begin, I would like to remind you to please state your name and your institution for the record when you are recognized by the chair at one of the numbered microphones.

### Consent Package

I'd like to note that Proposals 1 through 9 make up the consent package and will be considered as a group, unless there is an objection. These are the proposals that the Management Council and the Presidents Council have determined to be generally housekeeping in nature.

**Robert Heiny** (University of Northern Colorado): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move the consent package.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Paul Engelmann** (Central Missouri State University): I would request that Proposal 8 be removed from the consent package.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** I was supposed to have read something else. I will take that into consideration. But I need to read this for the record.

I am noting for you that Proposals Nos. 1, 5 and 9 have immediate effective dates. However, they are included in the consent package that is intended to be voted on as a group.

A separate vote on the immediate effective date for these proposals will only be necessary if a motion is made to withdraw a certain proposal from the consent package and consider it separately. That has occurred.



I'd also like to remind you that Proposal No. 5-D will be removed from the consent package and reordered to follow Proposal No. 22. If Proposal No. 22 is adopted, Proposal 5-D becomes moot.

Please note that before my announcement, Proposal 8 was asked to be withdrawn from the group. That is a nondebateable item. We will be voting on Proposals 1 through 7 and 9.

This is also a paddle vote. Please cast your vote by raising your paddle on the consent package — Proposal Nos. 1 through 7 and Proposal 9. Any opposition to the consent package, Proposals 1 through 7 and 9? The motion passes.

### **Eligibility – Collegiate All-Star Contests**

**Paul Engelmann** (Central Missouri State University): I move for an immediate effective date on Proposal No. 8.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Ms. Styles Johnston**: We must first vote on whether to establish an immediate effective date for the proposal. Then we will vote on the merits of the proposal separately, as amended, to include an immediate effective date. Any discussion?

**Mr. Engelmann**: This proposal was initiated by the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee, while Proposal 1 was initiated by the Legislation Committee. It wasn't discovered until after the amendment-to-amendment deadline that the proposals have different effective dates. In order to be consistent and have these restitution provisions become effective at the same time, we need to have an immediate effective date for Proposal 8. I urge your support on this motion.

**Ms. Styles Johnston**: Any further discussion on that issue?

[The immediate effective date for Proposal No. 8 was adopted.]

**Mr. Engelmann**: On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal 8.

[The motion was seconded.]

Like Proposal No. 1, this establishes restitution provisions with a dollar amount of \$50 for the appropriate legislation, Bylaw 16.

This makes the processing of secondary violations easier, without affecting the involved student-athlete's eligibility. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 8 was adopted.]

### **Legislative Process – Amendment-to-Amendment Requirements**

**Barbara Schroeder** (Regis University): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to move Proposal No. 10.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 10 is intended to create a mechanism to more easily sponsor an amendment-to-amendment. This concept was identified during a meeting of Division II committee chairs during the past calendar year.

This legislation would allow an amendment-to-amendment to be

sponsored by one conference or eight active member institutions, basically putting in place the old sponsorship requirements in existence prior to restructuring, but only for amendment-to-amendments.

The current requirement for initial sponsorship of legislation will remain. This change for amendment-to-amendment allows a more streamlined process for sponsorship. Currently, it is difficult to obtain the sponsorship necessary for an amendment-to-amendment in the limited window of opportunity that is permitted under current legislation. Therefore, there could be instances in which an amendment-to-amendment would approve a proposal or address an issue that the original sponsors may have overlooked, but minimum sponsorship cannot be obtained to place an amendment on the Convention Program.

[Proposal No. 10 was adopted.]

### **Legislative Process – Proposals Sponsored by Presidents Council**

**Jessica Kozloff** (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to move Proposal No. 11.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 11 is intended to give the Presidents Council authority to waive the September 1 Presidents Council sponsorship deadline for sponsoring legislation at future Conventions. This would allow the Presidents Council at its October meeting to sponsor legislation if the Council feels it's necessary.

Similar to the emergency legislation concept that we adopted last year, the Presidents Council fully intends to use great discretion in utilizing this authority. The primary purpose is to allow Division II to react quickly to any proposals that the Division I Board of Directors might adopt in October and therefore allow Division II to address the issue either in a positive or not positive way as soon as possible rather than waiting an entire year.

There is a November 1 deadline as part of this proposal, which would enable any such legislation to be placed in the Convention's Official Notice.

I urge your support on Proposal No. 11.

[Proposal No. 11 was adopted.]

### **Amateurism – Activities Prior To Initial Enrollment**

**Jerry McGee** (Wingate University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal 12.

[The motion was seconded.]

For almost a century, this Association has grown, moved forward and addressed issues within a philosophy of amateurism, which has remained largely neglected.

Our amateurism rules, which were established in 1906, applied

to enrolled student-athletes and their participation in intercollegiate athletics. Unfortunately, we have expanded these rules to the pre-enrollment period without first creating specific principles to guide us.

The work of the Amateurism Project Team reflects one of the first comprehensive studies of our amateurism rules and how they function in today's world. This legislation will allow us to address inconsistencies and problems created by our current rules.

The project team dug into the roots of our amateurism philosophy in order to evaluate the operation of our rules and how the rules lead to and cause certain problems.

This amateurism deregulation proposal was created in an atmosphere of serious deliberation and forethought. No one has played the devil's advocate more thoroughly than the project team itself. No one has tested the direction in which we are moving more rigorously than the project team.

While the project team was given the charge to evaluate amateurism issues, they actively sought the input and opinions of the entire membership, and many of us responded. As a result, this proposal is a group effort and is not simply the project team's creation.

Without question, this is the best and most progressive legislation that I have seen during my four years on the Presidents Council. Let's move this forward. Thank you.

**Carol Dunn** (California State University, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Amateurism Project Team, I am proud to speak in support of Proposal 12.

This proposal addresses two critical issues facing Division II regarding the impact of elite, experienced student-athletes dominating our championships.

While the educational experience is at the core of the Division II's philosophy, so is a level playing field. This proposal actually affords more individuals both athletic and educational opportunities, while also addressing the competitive inequity so prevalent in Division II.

Based on the project team's experiences and conversations with membership and the national Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, we realize that the elite athlete has an impact on our championships.

In the team sports of volleyball and men's basketball, the project team learned that the championships teams were led by student-athletes who had significant competitive experiences — in some cases, many years worth after high school graduation — prior to collegiate enrollment.

In individual sports like tennis and cross country, there has been similar domination for many years before collegiate enrollment.

The seasons-of-competition rule addresses the competitive advantages of the elite athlete and will level the playing field.

Regarding amateurism issues, the proposal shifts the focus from money toward increased opportunity. The project team challenged the fundamental notion that amateurism and money are mutually

exclusive. Essentially, the project team questioned why money is prohibited since it does not create a competitive advantage.

Instead, we focused on what is best for the student-athlete. Our answer to this question is reflected in this proposal. This legislation brings a much-needed common sense approach to our amateurism rules. We finally will be able to treat our prospects fairly while maintaining a real commitment to competitive equity.

I urge your support for Proposal 12.

**Anthony Capon** (University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown): On behalf of the Amateurism Project Team, the Management Council and the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee, of which I am also the chair, I wish to speak in support of Proposal No. 12.

The Amateurism Project Team, the Management Council and the Presidents Council have come to understand some little-realized consequences of our current amateurism rules that have been apparent to the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee for many years.

When we insist on imposing our amateurism rules on prospects, we deny some athletes with disadvantaged backgrounds or unique circumstances the opportunity to pursue sports that may require significant expenses for equipment, coaching and travel; we ensure that some sports lack diversity; we prevent dreams and aspirations from being realized; we deny equal opportunities and access based on an antiquated notion.

The standards that were appropriate in the early 20th century are less appropriate early in the 21st. Our current rules and regulations not only fail to promote the welfare of prospective student-athletes they also serve to encourage prospective student-athletes to postpone collegiate enrollment to gain a competitive advantage; they perpetuate and exacerbate competitive inequity; and they work to the detriment of the welfare of enrolled student-athletes.

The process that we have followed to bring about these proposals has been the most inclusive process that I have witnessed since federation. The project team presented to and consulted with nearly every athletic conference, the athletic directors association, the conference commissioners, the faculty athletic representatives, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. We solicited your comments. We solicited your criticisms and your suggestions.

This has been a membership-initiated and membership-driven process. I urge you to support these proposals. This is the right thing to do, and now is the right time to do it.

**Kent Wyatt** (Delta State University): I would like to speak in support of this proposal.

As a former Division II president and a member of the Amateurism Project Team, I'm excited at the prospect that the amateurism proposal provides us. It gives us the opportunity to do the right thing, the right way, to be the division that truly wants what is best for the student-athlete.

It gives us the opportunity to treat all prospects with consistent

application of legislation. The project team has taken its charge in the spirit of seriousness and innovation, and I believe we've gotten it right.

Not only are we interested in this division going down the right path, but we're also committed to being there for you along the way. If this proposal passes, the project team will be monitoring the state of amateurism after deregulation in order to ensure that we continue to operate under the best set of rules possible for Division II.

I've been involved in Division II for more than a quarter of a century. I care deeply about the future of this division. That's why I strongly encourage you to support this legislation. Thank you.

**Stephanie Harris** (Saint Leo University): I represent the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 12. Our committee believes that it is essential to pass this legislation today because it hits at the heart of Division II student-athlete welfare and competitive equity.

We think that this legislation will shift the focus of athlete eligibility to what is important — competition, instead of focusing on money. We also would like to express that this legislation also hits at the heart of what the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee stands for — creating opportunities for student-athletes.

By passing this legislation, including the academic year in residence, we will be ensuring that we are meeting the needs of student-athletes.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee knows that each person is here for a common purpose — to enhance the experience of our Division II athletes. We ask that you support Proposal No. 12 in order to make a long-lasting and positive impact on the lives of thousands of people like those of us who serve on this committee and who want the opportunity to compete in our division.

[Proposal No. 12 was adopted, 217-29-2.]

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** We are now ready to move to Proposal No. 13. This is a paddle vote. I want you to note that the Presidents Council has agreed not to remove this proposal during today's business session because of strong opposition stated by the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. The Presidents Council has agreed to defer to the will of the membership whether this proposal will be moved for consideration.

### **Recruiting – Telephone Calls**

**Jerry Hughes** (Central Missouri State University): I would like to move Proposal No. 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

As you recall, a year ago, Proposal No. 35 was defeated at the 2000 Convention based largely and appropriately upon concerns by the national SAAC. This legislation was redrafted to address those concerns.

The concerns, as you recall, were that a year ago, we were allowing students who signed admissions or financial aid letters after the early letter of intent period to receive unlimited phone calls.

This legislation now has been amended where it would be student-athletes who sign admissions or financial aid letters after the traditional spring national letters. With this legislation, we will be treating both groups of student-athletes the same — those who we sign to National Letters of Intent, and those who sign admissions or financial aid letters on our own campuses.

Without this legislation, it would require our compliance offices to track those two groups of students differently. Those students who sign an NLI may receive unlimited phone calls. Those students who sign an admissions or financial aid agreement with our campus can receive only one phone call per week.

I think in the spirit of deregulation, we should keep those two groups of students consistent and allow our compliance officers not to add a burdensome task to their already difficult job.

**Christina Kaesebier** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Drury University): The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee opposes Proposal No. 13, Recruiting – Telephone Calls. We feel that any unlimited phone calls are intrusive to the prospective collegiate student-athlete's personal life and may impair the decision-making process.

Student-athletes can sign numerous offers of admission or financial aid, allowing various institutions the right to make unlimited phone calls.

The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee's mission statement says that we protect student-athletes' welfare. In opposing this bylaw, we are doing such. Thank you.

**James Fallis** (University of Northern Colorado): With all due respect to my mentor, let us not create a situation that might imply commitment that is not binding. By allowing unlimited phone calls, you will unwittingly have created the perception of a commitment that exists when they sign a National Letter of Intent because athletic grant and aid has been awarded.

With today's modern technology, coaches can easily fax, e-mail or refer to Web pages to communicate with so-called walk-ons. In addition, coaches still have the one call a week, along with the prospective student-athlete's ability to call the coach unlimited times.

Keep in mind also, when a student-athlete signs a National Letter of Intent, while there are unlimited phone calls, there is obviously reduction in tracking of phone calls that needs to be done by your compliance officer.

I would urge your defeat of Proposal 13.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** Seeing no further individuals at microphones, we're ready now for a paddle vote on Proposal 13. All those in favor, please raise your paddles; opposed. For this issue, we're going to have to go to a machine vote.

[Proposal No. 13 was defeated, 116-133-2.]

### **Initial Eligibility – Core Curriculum Requirements – Computer Science**

**Diane Husic** (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Core-Course Review Committee, I move Proposal 14.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 14 is intended to address a change in high-school curriculum offerings in the area of computer science. Computer science was included as an academic area in the original curriculum legislation due to the nature of computer science courses that were offered at the time by high schools across the country.

When the core-curriculum academic areas were initially legislated almost 20 years ago, computer science courses were predominantly programming in nature. However, as the use of computers has become standard practice in secondary school education, computer science curriculum has evolved to include application-based courses, covering everything from basic software applications to the use of e-mail on the Internet.

While such courses may be valuable at the secondary school level, they typically have become courses about practical application, rather than academic preparation for college.

Elimination of computer science courses from the core curriculum areas will ensure that students are truly completing 13 units of course work in college preparatory academic areas.

I would like to note that this proposal, if adopted, has an effective date of August 1st, 2005. Thus, there is plenty of opportunity to begin educational efforts through the playbook materials, the NCAA Web site, the annual educational Web cast for the high school community, and other educational programs focusing on initial-eligibility requirements.

Some concerns have been expressed regarding the lack of high-school input on this issue. I would like to remind the membership that the Core-Course Review Committee does have members representing the high-school community, and these individuals consult with their constituents when proposals for legislative changes are made. Thus, in consideration of the original intent of the core-course requirements, I urge your support of Proposal 14.

**Kevin Hickey** (Assumption College): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 14. The current core-curriculum areas were legislated in the early 1980s when computer science courses were programming-based and academic in nature, as was intended by the original legislation.

Today, the majority of high-school computer courses no longer contain programming elements, but rather teach skills such as the use of a desktop computer and software applications. Although these software/keyboarding skills may be beneficial to some college-bound

students, they are not academic in nature.

Given these changes in technology and secondary school curriculums, removing these computer science courses from core-curriculum areas will ensure that students are truly completing 13 academic courses, which was the original intent of the legislation.

It should be noted that computer courses that concentrate on the intricacies of programming and utilize approved academic programs can still be included as mathematics or science core-course requirements.

It should also be noted that the high-school community is aware of this proposed change through their five representatives on the Core-Course Review Committee, which proposed this change, and their two members on the additional Academic Core-Course Subcommittee, one of whom is a specialist in computer science. They support this proposal. Based on their support and this rationale, I urge your support of Proposal 14.

**Ed Hammond** (Fort Hays State University): I rise to oppose Proposal 14 because I believe it significantly weakens the purpose of the core. The core itself was created to prepare high-school students for success in college. It weakens the core because it removes the computer courses from the preparation.

Kansas just adopted its core curriculum and included computer literacy courses as part of its core for graduation and admission to Regents institutions based upon research that showed it was one of the best predictors of success in college.

Secondly, to take the computer courses and move them into the math area further weakens the core. Instead of two years of math, they would only have one year of math and one computer science course.

Third, the legislation is flawed for a couple of reasons. Some of the people say they want to remove keyboarding from the curriculum that's used in the core. If that's the intent, we can do the same thing we did with the natural sciences, which was to add a descriptor that said that in the natural sciences and physical sciences, at least one laboratory course needs to be included. We could remove keyboarding without throwing out all of the computer literacy courses with it.

Also, you've heard the comment that it lacks academic rigor. I would be willing to bet that for every single institution in this room that the computer literacy course on your campus gets academic credit. If you're giving academic credit for it on your campus, how in the world are we going to decide it lacks academic rigor as a core-curriculum course for the NCAA core curriculum?

Last but not least, I believe that the core, itself, has served us well for a number of years. I see no reason to change it at this time. I have yet to see any documented research that shows that removing the computer course from our core does anything but weaken the intent of the core.

**Jessica Kozloff** (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania):



Again, speaking on behalf of the Presidents Council, and speaking in support of Proposal No. 14, the Presidents Council's support rests on our understanding that the courses that are currently called computer science courses in the high schools have become computer application courses.

While we understand that these courses do provide benefits to students in utilizing the computer, they do not meet the intent of core courses being academic and preparing students to academically succeed at four-year colleges. Therefore, the justification for the elimination of computer science courses, which are application courses, as an acceptable academic core-course discipline, seems appropriate to us.

However, it is important to note that true academic computer programming courses may be acceptable in meeting the core-course requirements if the course is awarded mathematics or science credits.

In addition, the Presidents Council felt it was persuasive that we have an effective date of 2005, which does give adequate time for advising. I would also point out that the Presidents Council has agreed to refer the issue of computer application courses and whether they should eventually be included in the core curriculum in some way back to the Academic Requirements Committee for its consideration.

Therefore, on behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge your support of Proposal 14.

**Mary Lisko** (Augusta State University): I am chair of the Academic Requirements Committee.

On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I would urge you to support Proposition No. 14. In the past, the high schools did teach true computer science courses. The content dealt with the languages of FORTRAN, Pascal, Cobalt and several others, as well as programming in those languages. Because of this language component, our legislation did allow them to be used in the same area as other foreign language courses as additional core courses.

The courses have now been replaced by this very different type of computer course. Today's computer courses have evolved from the previous typing courses. They generally deal with the practical side of computer usage such as keyboarding, formatting documents, e-mail and surfing the Internet.

While we acknowledge that these skills are extremely important, as is test taking, library use and time management skills, courses covering these other pragmatic skills also do not meet the intent of our legislation for academic courses.

Over the past few years, the Core-Course Committee has removed numerous computer course syllabi in order to distinguish the computer science courses that are allowed with our legislation from the other type of courses. Our legislation was not written to allow the inclusion of any course dealing with computers to count as

a core academic course.

There has been some concern expressed that some high schools may not offer enough courses for a student to be able to meet our legislation. Consider this: If over a full four years of high school a student takes one more than the minimum of three in the area of English, one more than the minimum of two in the area of math, one more than the minimum of two in science, and one more than the minimum of two in the social sciences, that student will already have met the initial-eligibility core requirements. With students having anywhere between 24 and 32 course opportunities during their four years of high school, we should hope that they would take at least 13 of these in solid academic areas.

In fact, currently, the number of core courses taken by students registering with the Clearinghouse is slightly over 17. So this legislation will affect only a very limited number of lesser prepared students, those who might be most at risk on our campuses.

We would also like to point out that if the high school does grant mathematics credit and includes these in the math and computer area, these courses would continue to be used.

Finally, I would like again to reiterate that the date of implementation is not until August 2005, allowing next year's high-school freshmen a full four years, which is ample time to adequately meet the 13 core-course requirements.

I urge your support of Proposal No. 14.

**Jose-Orlando Lopez** (American University of Puerto Rico): I rise to oppose Proposal 14 on the fact that the core athlete study does say that we do need our students to develop and maintain academic work during the college year.

On the other hand, it is virtually impossible for a student to do well without enough computer literacy at this point at any university, given the fact that most libraries today are online. Many courses are online or mixed.

On the other hand, as part of the Harvard Association for Internet in Society, I certainly oppose the fact that we're legislating five years before, when technology five years from now will certainly be totally different than what we're seeing now. So will be the computer courses that we will see five years from now. I think it's too much in the future to determine at this point.

Thank you very much.

**Elwyn Davis** (Pittsburg State University): I rise in support of this. I would like to answer some of the comments that have been made in opposition, if I might.

It was mentioned that in the state of Kansas, we now have a computer literacy requirement for admission to the colleges. I was, in fact, on the state-wide committee that looked into this. We found a tremendous variety of courses that were taught in the high schools. Some of them were legitimate academic courses. Others, six- to 10-year-old children already had more information than was in the

courses, so I believe it's not really appropriate to count these courses.

Another objection has been raised about what this does to the mathematics and science requirements. It's my observation, being a mathematics professor 32 years, that the students who come to the colleges that have had programming have already had lots of mathematics. So I do not believe that counting this in mathematics, will water down the mathematics requirements at all. The students have to have had mathematics at least two years, or they are not going to succeed in the programming courses.

So I believe that the objections that have been raised are not really valid — particularly the most recent one about the future. It is indeed true that technology is changing very, very rapidly. All that, it seems to me, strengthens the argument against having computer literacy courses in the core, because we have no idea what they are going to be like in the near future.

[Proposal No. 14 was adopted.]

### **Financial Aid – Eligibility For Financial Aid**

**Sharon Taylor** (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 15.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 15 is intended to permit athletically related financial aid for a maximum of 10 semesters or 15 quarters and to permit the awarding of institutional financial aid after this time period in a manner consistent with the institution's policy for awarding aid to all students.

This proposal removes the current monitoring requirements for providing aid within six years of initial enrollment and permitting only earned aid after that time.

This change makes financial aid eligibility consistent with the 10-semester rule and allows institutions to award aid subsequent to the 10th semester or 15th quarter, in accordance with the institutional policy.

The proposal clearly meets the objectives of Division II rules deregulation, and I urge your support of it.

[Proposal No. 15 was adopted 229-14-2.]

### **Financial Aid – Tuition Waivers**

**Michael Kovalchik** (Hillsdale College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 16.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 16 specifies that institutional out-of-state tuition waivers not awarded based in any degree on athletics ability are exempt from individual and institutional financial aid limits.

Currently, many institutions are required to count the value of tuition waivers that are triggered by an academic or other institutional scholarship that have no relationship to athletics ability. This occurs when a student-athlete is a counter due to the receipt of ath-

letic aid and then receives another institutional award unrelated to athletics that triggers a waiver.

When such a waiver is awarded, the Legislation Committee believes it should not affect individual or institutional limits, which often happens and often is a significant increase in equivalencies.

It is important to note that to exempt such a waiver, there must exist clear documentation and understanding that the waiver is in no way related to athletics ability. Absent such evidence, the waiver must continue to be counted.

I urge your support of Proposal 16.

**Michael Marcil** (North Central Conference): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of this proposal.

We have seen many states establish permissive policies related to out-of-state tuition waivers in an effort to attract and retain out-of-state students. Although this is a formidable approach to increase enrollment at state-supported institutions, it has a fundamental inconsistency with NCAA legislation in that these waivers are in most cases not mandated. They are permissible, meaning the institution has the authority whether to implement them or not.

This triggers such waivers as countable aid for student-athletes who are counters and has played havoc with equivalency limits in situations when the granting of such waivers is done without the involvement of the athletics department.

This proposal is a solution to this problem in those instances when such a waiver has no relationship with athletics ability and no relationship to the receipt of athletics aid.

I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 16 was adopted, 201-41-2.]

### **Financial Aid – Academic Honors Awards and Honorary Academic Awards**

**Jerry Vandergriff** (Angelo State University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal 17 is to clarify the application of academic honors awards and all other academic awards from impacting honor awards and counting in individual financial aid limits.

This is a simple proposal involving as much as any proposal in this legislation the Division II Manual. It makes little change to the legislation. It simply takes two academic awards and puts them in one place in the Manual to make the legislation easier to locate and apply.

Exempting academic honors awards from individual limits is a fairness issue. In situations in which student-athletes receive legitimate academic awards that meet the legislative minimum criteria, those student-athletes should not be required to forfeit the award because it causes them to exceed their individual financial aid limit.

I urge your support of this proposal.  
[Proposal No. 17 was adopted, 243-3-0.]

### **Financial Aid – Employee Dependent Tuition Benefits**

**Kim Vinson** (Cameron University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 18 is intended to eliminate the requirement that an institution must count employee dependent tuition benefit waivers against individual and institutional financial aid limits. This is also a fairness issue to both the student-athlete and the equivalency limit in the student-athlete's sport.

It is virtually impossible for athletic department staff members to have an influence in awarding such waivers. These are only awarded in those limited situations when a student-athlete may decide to attend an institution, in most cases as a walk-on, and the student-athlete's parent is an employee at that institution or an institution is involved in a consortium with the awarding institution.

Use of such waivers as a recruiting tool will not occur in Division II for 99 percent of our membership. We don't need legislation to try to control the other 1 percent. We have done that too many years, and that is why the Division Manual is 349 pages long.

I urge your support of Proposal 18.

**Charles Dunn** (Henderson State University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal 18.

As a Division II president, I would like to point out to the delegates that many of our universities include dependent tuition benefits as part of the benefit package. Recognition of these and equivalency computations should not occur in Division II.

I recognize that Division I coaches may be able to find a high-profile athlete who could be enticed to enroll at the school by promising employment to parents. Then, in turn, that would be exempt from the cost of the student's tuition. That would not happen and should not happen in Division II.

If a Division II coach promises employment to a prospect's parent as a way to award the dependent waiver, that institution has a preferential treatment problem or an ethical conduct problem that will be much more important to the Committee on Infractions than whether or not the aid is exempted.

This is a good example of good Division II deregulation, and I urge your support. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 18 was adopted, 232-14-1.]

### **Financial Aid – On-Campus Employment**

**Ms. Styles Johnston**: I just want to note for the delegates before we get started on this proposal that Proposal No. 28 will be moot if this particular proposal is adopted.

**Sue Willey** (University of Indianapolis): On behalf of the

Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 19 is intended to exempt all on-campus employment earnings from both individual and institutional financial aid limits. This proposal is related to the deregulation objectives of simplifying Division II legislation and eliminating legislation that may not be consistent with the Division II philosophy.

Currently, the membership is sometimes unclear as to when on-campus employment should count toward limits. Further, it is sometimes difficult to explain to student-athletes why they are prohibited from working on campus to earn extra spending money because they are already at their individual limit.

The Legislation Committee agrees that since Division II institutions use student employment on a regular basis it makes sense to exempt on-campus employment from all limits.

The committee does not believe the majority of Division II institutions have the resources to implement work programs as well as fund the maximum amount of grants in a given sport.

Bylaw 12 continues to prohibit a student-athlete from being paid for work that is not performed or from being paid exorbitant amounts for work.

This is a significant step in simplifying financial aid legislation and is a positive step. We need to allow our student-athletes to work on campus without affecting limits while making our legislation easier to administer. This is good legislation. I urge your support.

**Pamela Gill-Fisher** (University of California, Davis): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal 19.

This amendment is a result of the deregulation efforts of the Division II Legislation Committee. The committee studied financial aid issues for a year and received meaningful input from student-athletes, coaches, financial aid directors and athletic administrators.

The committee believes, and I agree, that in the best interests of student-athletes, all on-campus employment earnings should be exempted from being considered countable institutional financial aid. The potential for abuse when this proposal is adopted is limited, since very few, if any, Division II institutions can afford to abuse this rule.

In addition, I am confident that the Division II membership, through the work of the Division II Committee on Infractions, will act swiftly if any institution deliberately tries to circumvent the intent of this legislation.

On behalf of the Division II Management Council, and for the benefit of our student-athletes, I urge your support of Proposal 19.

**Patricia Cormier** (Longwood College): I am a member of the Presidents Council.

The Division II Presidents Council is sponsoring this proposal as one of several deregulation proposals related to Bylaw 15. As you

know, Bylaw 15 impacts our student-athletes at least as much as any other bylaw.

The Legislation Committee should be commended for soliciting input on these proposals from a variety of sources, including student-athletes. For those of you who may oppose this proposal because of anticipated abuses, I urge you to reconsider your position. It is time to embrace facilitating an environment for Division II that is based on trust. A lack of trust has resulted in a 400-page tome of rules and regulations. We are making unprecedented progress in our efforts to deregulate in Division II, but we will achieve total success only if we agree to trust each other.

I urge your support of this proposal.

**Kyle Guerrant** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus): I am speaking in support of Proposal 19 on behalf of the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

Our committee is in favor of broadening the opportunity for student-athletes to find additional income on campus. This proposal would allow for the equitable treatment of all students on campus. This proposal will also ensure that student-athletes will not miss out on employment opportunities based on whether or not a coach has met his or her equivalency maximum.

The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly feels that student-athletes should be able to experience the privileges that Proposal 19 would allow them. We urge you to lend your support to this piece of legislation.

[Proposal No. 19 was adopted, 215-28-0.]

### **Exempted Government Grants – Federal Supplemental Education Opportunities Grant (SEOG)**

**Dede Allen** (University of Alaska Anchorage): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 20 is intended to allow institutions to exempt SEOG grants from institutional and individual limits. A student-athlete who receives a grant that is based on financial need, much like the Pell grant, should be permitted to receive such a grant without affecting the individual or the institutional financial aid limits even when the institution has involvement in the selection of the recipients and amounts.

The committee is not concerned with abuse of such a change because the financial aid office has the ultimate authority for administration of this award and the selection of recipients. The amount may not be based on athletics ability.

Further, institutional financial aid offices are annually audited in regards to the administration of SEOG funds and would jeopardize the receipt of those funds if it was discovered that athletic staff members had influenced the decisions made by the financial aid office.

I urge your support of Proposal 20.

**Charles Dunn** (Henderson State University): I rise in support of Proposal 20.

SEOG funds, when managed under appropriate guidelines, are awarded to students who have significant financial need. In many ways, these are the poorest of the poor of our students. This group may include student-athletes, of course. When that occurs, it should not penalize our equivalency limits or our student-athlete individual limits.

This is a good example of the right thing to do. I urge your support of Proposal No. 20. Thank you.

**James Fallis** (University of Northern Colorado): I want to commend the Legislation Committee, the Management Council and the Presidents Council on their work in providing us an opportunity to review items of deregulation.

I do have a concern with this legislation and what impact it may have on programs. I look at this as not only a student-athlete welfare issue, but also a competitive issue.

But I see it from a different viewpoint. At our institution, each program is allocated so many dollars for grants-in-aid. Of course, such programs as basketball, volleyball and football happen to receive the largest amount of grant-in-aid. These sports also have the majority of full-need students.

If the SEOG becomes noncountable, then there will be a financial gap in the existing grant-in-aid budget that needs to be filled one of two ways: Raise more money; or reallocate grant-in-aid from other sports such as baseball, softball, tennis, golf, track and the like.

At our institution, the average grant-in-aid in sports other than basketball, football and volleyball is less than \$1,500 per student, which means that when somebody is receiving a \$3,000 SEOG grant in basketball, they are now ineligible to also receive a full grant-in-aid. At our institution, that could equate to two student-athletes in sports such as baseball, softball, tennis and golf who would not receive athletic grant-in-aid because you have now channeled that money to a basketball or volleyball player.

I'm looking at the welfare of those student-athletes in a broad-based program. I urge everybody, and I'm sure you've all done this, to ask the question: How much SEOG funding does exist at your institution? How much SEOG money is awarded to your student-athletes? What is your institution's distribution policy?

We have heard that there is a federal audit. The federal government comes in and audits whether full-need students receive that money. That's the extent of it. The institution can award from \$100 to \$4,000 in SEOG money. I repeat, the institution can decide the award, \$100 to \$4,000, in SEOG money. The institution can decide to use that money as recruiting money and focus it on incoming freshmen or they may decide to give it to senior student-athletes.

I think there are a lot of questions and a lot of problems with this



that we haven't discussed. I would like to see what the average of SEOG funding is awarded at institutions.

I would urge you to defeat or at least abstain on this. Thank you.

**James Battle** (Virginia Union University): I want to speak in support of the passage of this proposal.

My question would be: How many Division II institutions have the athletic grant budgets where they award a lot of full granting privileges from the athletic grant budget? For every dollar that would be freed up by not having to count the SEOG money that a student may be awarded, it would free up dollars in the athletic grant budget that would help other students.

I know at my institution almost every year we have money remaining in the athletic grant budget at the end of the year that we can't use because a sport has reached the grant limit because of having to count SEOG money. So we would not count the SEOG money. These are dollars in our athletic grant budget that we can use to help other students who have a genuine need. As someone said, the students who are awarded SEOG money are students who have a need.

There's a different perspective when you look at state institutions that perhaps have a low cost of attendance and private institutions that have a high cost of attendance where coaches and student-athletes have to struggle to really put together a financial aid package for student-athletes that is significant in terms of reducing the cost that the student has to pay for his or her education.

By allowing money to be freed up into the athletic grant budget by not counting SEOG, we enhance participation because we can aid more students from the athletic grant budget. It has an impact on gender equity, particularly in our women's sports programs. It's just a good piece of legislation in terms of providing more access to athletic participation to more students by not having to count the SEOG money because every dollar that's not counted in the SEOG award, frees up that same dollar in the athletic grant budget from a sport when you don't have to count that against the individual institutional limits.

I urge support and passage of this proposal. Thank you.

**Jose-Orlando Lopez** (American University of Puerto Rico): I rise for the approval of this proposal. Title IV funds of the Federal Education Act are need-based funds that do put a limit on the amount a student is given. This is a way to help underprivileged students, especially those institutions that serve large amounts of underprivileged students and minorities, to make justice to them. I do commend all the Boards on this proposal and other proposals on financial aid that will help these underprivileged minorities. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 20 was adopted, 200-42-5.]

### **Financial Aid – Off-Campus Employment During Vacation Period**

**Mark Gardner** (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania): On

behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

In reviewing Division II financial aid legislation, the Legislation Committee agreed that current restrictions on off-campus employment should remain. In particular, any off-campus employment for which athletics interest or athletic staff intercedes should continue to count against individual and institutional limits. However, the committee believes that employment earnings during official institutional vacation periods should be exempt from both individual and institutional financial limits.

Currently in Division II, it is rare for any off-campus employment to be counted against financial aid limits since most student-athletes secure such employment in the same manner as the general student body.

Institutions that have procedures in place to effectively monitor off-campus employment continue to have difficulty monitoring such employment during vacation periods. Legislation exists now to exempt such employment during the Christmas vacation, and this philosophy should extend to all institutional vacation periods.

I urge your support of Proposal 21.

[Proposal No. 21 was adopted 238-8-1.]

### **Summer Financial Aid**

**Leon Kerry** (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 22.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is probably uncommon for Division II institutions to have budgets that allow them to award significant amounts of summer athletic-related financial aid. For those institutions that award athletic-related summer aid, the policies and rules relating to awards should be set by the institution and should be monitored by the financial aid office consistent with the monitoring of other institutional aid provided to the general student body during the summer terms.

Further, from a student-athlete welfare perspective, student-athletes should have the same access to summer athletic aid as other students have to institutional awards and scholarships without the restrictions set forth under the current legislation, especially when those restrictions are difficult to interpret and to apply.

This is a rule simplification and is good deregulation. I urge your support of Proposal No. 22.

[Proposal No. 22 was adopted, 218-29-0.]

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** A point of reference. Passing Proposal No. 22 means that Proposal No. 5-D is moot.

### **Financial Aid – Awarding Institutional Financial Aid to Professional Athlete**

**Ross Brummett** (Carson-Newman College): On behalf of the

Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

The majority of Division II student-athletes who become professionals in a sport receive minimal compensation for their participation at the professional level.

Currently, a student-athlete who receives minimum compensation from competing in a professional sport and who wishes to participate in a different sport at a Division II institution is denied the opportunity to receive athletically related financial aid.

This legislative change would permit a student-athlete who has attempted to play professionally in a sport for minimal compensation, for example baseball, the opportunity to receive aid in another sport, for example football, at a Division II institution.

This is legislation that allows Division II to distinguish itself from the other divisions as it relates to providing athletic aid to student-athletes. It is good legislation for Division II institutions and student-athletes, especially since we deal with equivalency sports and typically provide minimal partial grants to Division II student-athletes.

I urge your support of Proposal 23.

**Jerry Hughes** (Central Missouri State University): On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 23.

The Management Council agrees with the Legislation Committee that a student-athlete who professionalizes himself in one sport but wishes to return to a Division II institution and play in a different sport should be permitted to receive financial aid.

We are not talking about John Elway and Ricky Williams, both of whom made large amounts of money playing professional baseball while in college. We are talking about an individual who signed a rookie league baseball contract and received little if any expenses or salary and subsequently wants to play Division II football while receiving a college education but needs financial aid help to be able to attend college. Our legislation should permit the institution, at its discretion, to award this individual athletically related aid.

I urge your support of Proposal 23.

[Proposal No. 23 was adopted, 227-18-1.]

### **Financial Aid – Counters**

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** I have a note for you. If Proposal No. 24 is adopted, then Proposal No. 26-B will be moot.

**Sharon Taylor** (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 24.

[The motion was seconded.]

Bona fide employment in the athletics department should not in and of itself cause an individual to become a counter, thereby requiring that all other institutional aid be counted against the team equivalency limit in the student-athlete's sport.

The committee recognizes that it would be possible for an institution to provide employment in the athletics department in order to not trigger counter status, and as a result, to exempt other nonathletically related institutional aid received by the student-athlete.

However, the committee does not feel such legislation would be abused in Division II due to two facts: Athletics budgets are scrutinized from outside the department as money is expended on student employment; and most Division II institutions do not have unlimited financial resources for student employment.

It's also important to note that the existing legislation related to certification of noncounter status remains applicable. Specifically, for a student-athlete to receive institutional financial aid other than athletically related aid and not be considered a counter, the student-athlete's aid must be certified as having been granted without regard to athletic ability. This certification covers employment earnings inside or outside the athletics department.

The concept embodied in Proposal 24 is consistent with other deregulation proposals that allow Division II student-athletes to earn extra money while receiving other institutional aid. I urge your support for the proposal.

[Proposal No. 24 was adopted, 227-20-1.]

#### **Maximum Institutional Grant-in-Aid Limitations – Injury or Illness After Initial Practice**

**Robert Heiny** (University of Northern Colorado): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 25.

[The motion was seconded.]

Under current legislation, a student-athlete who has a career-ending injury or illness subsequent to the initial practice would continue to be a counter during any term in the same academic year that occurs subsequent to his or her injury or illness. When the award is for the academic year, a replacement is not possible until the next year.

By deregulating the restrictions on institutional limits in this situation, an institution may continue to provide the injured student-athlete with financial aid for the remainder of the year and exempt the student-athlete from institutional limits. Under this proposal, if budgets permit, aid could be awarded to another student-athlete without exceeding the equivalency limit in the student-athlete's sport in the same academic year.

Current legislation permits an institution to exempt a student-athlete's aid for an entire year if an injury occurs prior to his or her first practice. This proposal will require the institution to count the student-athlete for one term if the injury occurred during or subsequent to the first practice, but would not penalize the institution and the student-athlete in subsequent terms.

[Proposal No. 25 was adopted, 238-6-1.]

## Financial Aid-Counters

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** I want to make a note that we are only voting on 26-A, because of previous action that we took on another proposal.

**Mike Kovalchik** (Hillsdale College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 26.

[The motion was seconded.]

In Division II, it is not necessary for counter status to be contingent upon the recruited status of a student-athlete. Instead, counter status should be contingent primarily on receipt of athletic aid and/or institutional aid.

The Manual can be significantly simplified by amending legislation to treat recruited and nonrecruited student-athletes consistently. This proposal does not amend who would be a counter or provide relief to exempt aid that currently triggers counter status. This recommendation simply sets forth three criteria for an institution to evaluate when determining the counter status of the student-athlete.

The only component lost in this revision is the requirement for the admissions director to certify that the student-athlete's admission was granted without regard to athletics ability. The committee does not believe this is a significant change, but that this proposal is a significant step in deregulating financial aid legislation. I urge your support of Proposal 26-A.

[Proposal No. 26 was adopted, 243-4-2.]

## Financial Aid – Multiple-Sport Participants

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** We're now at Proposal 27, Deregulation No. 13. I would like to refer you to two interpretations of this proposal that were distributed to delegates this morning. You should have them at your seats.

**Jerry Vandergriff** (Angelo State University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal 27.

[The motion was seconded.]

Current multiple-sport student-athletes who participate in basketball, field hockey or women's volleyball must count in that sport for which he or she practices with the team. However, a football student-athlete who also participates in another sport and was not recruited or awarded aid in football only counts against football if he practices and competes.

Division II institutions should have some discretion to count multiple-sport athletes in either sport in which they legitimately participate.

The Legislation Committee discussed the advantages and disadvantages of this concept thoroughly and ultimately agreed that as amended, this legislation would not create a competitive advantage and that it will assist in the understanding and application of financial aid legislation.

Further, the committee expressed concern that current legisla-

tion provides loopholes and permits institutions to hide players if the institution wishes to do so.

Further, the committee believes the legislation needs clarification by eliminating the recruiting/nonrecruiting reference, since contacts and telephone calls are institutional specific and therefore cause misunderstanding when evaluating the counter status of multiple-sport student-athletes.

This is a significant step in the deregulation of financial aid and certainly meets all three deregulation objectives. This concept has been thoroughly reviewed and discussed over the past 14 months and is very good legislation for Division II. I urge your support of this proposal.

**Kim Vinson** (Cameron University): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 27-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Current legislation setting forth the requirements for counting aid for a multiple-sport student-athlete should be revised. It is possible to hide players in sports in which they were not recruited to play and using equivalencies available in one sport to recruit and grant athletics aid in another sport under current legislation.

More importantly, current legislation arguably restricts participation opportunities in Division II. For example, a student-athlete receiving minimal athletically related financial aid in track and field is not permitted to walk on the basketball team if the institution already has awarded the maximum number of equivalencies in basketball.

It is important to note that in order to divide a multiple-sport student-athlete's aid, the individual must meet the legislation criteria set forth in the bylaws that state requirements to qualify as a multiple-sport athlete.

This legislation prohibits an institution from counting an individual in any sport that they are not legitimately participating. This amendment-to-amendment is intended to modify the original proposal to state that distribution of aid for multiple-sport student-athletes must be set forth in writing on the student-athlete's financial aid agreement in order to enable the institution to divide the aid for institutional limit purposes.

I urge your support of Proposal 27 and 27-1.

**Ed Harris** (West Texas A&M University): On behalf of the Management Council and Presidents Council, I would like to speak in support of the amendment-to-amendment.

Proposal 27-1 was developed by the Legislation Committee at the request of the Management Council and the Presidents Council to address some of the concerns relating to the original proposal. Primarily, those concerns related to the complete opening of the door for institutions to count aid received by multiple-sport participation without any documentation or decision-making responsibility prior to the academic year.

This modification of Proposal 27 alleviates that concern and eliminates the ability of an institution to change the distribution of aid after the financial aid agreement has been signed or the academic year begins.

Institutions will have the discretion on how to count the aid for multiple-sport counters, but with this amendment, they must make that a part of the financial aid contract and distribution of aid must be articulated in the agreement.

I urge your support of Proposal 27-1.

**Albert Shannon** (Saint Joseph's College, Indiana): As a member of the Presidents Council, I rise in support of 27-1, the amendment-to-amendment. After much discussion on whether to sponsor Proposal 27, the Presidents Council agreed that this amendment to the original proposal was the missing language that makes this good deregulation legislation.

It's time for us to trust each other. This is a great opportunity to prove it by knowing that we can eliminate difficult legislation by adopting a concept with this amendment that puts us where Division II needs to be on this issue.

With this amendment, the potential for abuse is eliminated for those of us who apply the appropriate intent of this proposal and Proposal 27.

On behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 27-1 was adopted, 199-42-6.]

**Clint Bryant** (Augusta State University): On behalf of the Management Council, I want to speak in support of Proposal No. 27. I would like to tell a quick story related to this issue.

In 1999, a softball student-athlete at Augusta State University who was receiving a partial athletic grant wanted to walk on to the women's basketball team. She was an outstanding basketball student-athlete as well as an outstanding softball student-athlete. She desired to participate in Division II athletics in a second sport during the off-season of her primary sport. This should be okay, I think. The Division II philosophy statement, in two different places, addresses participation opportunities for student-athletes.

Well, it wasn't okay because Augusta State had already awarded 10 equivalencies in women's basketball. Some of these basketball student-athletes were not even participating due to injury. I had to explain to this young lady and her parents why NCAA rules prohibited her from joining the basketball team. This should not happen in Division II. It isn't what we are about.

Granted, we may have to tweak this legislation once it is implemented, but this is a great start. Once again, we need to be a step ahead of our colleagues in the other divisions in taking a significant step in simplifying our legislation and matching our legislation more closely to our philosophy statement.

I feel that this proposal is student-athlete friendly, and I strongly urge your support of Proposal No. 27.

**Justin Stein** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Bryant College): I'm representing the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 27, Financial Aid — Multiple-Sport Participants. This proposal promotes a key part of our mission statement by promoting opportunity for all student-athletes. The committee feels that this legislation will encourage two-sport athletes. This ability to participate in two sports is part of what makes Division II athletics special and unique.

Currently, a player who participates as a scholarship athlete in one sport may not have the opportunity to walk on to another sport because the coach may have reached his or her allowable number of scholarships. This legislation will protect that student-athlete.

In addition, Proposal No. 27 will allow a student-athlete who receives a partial scholarship in one sport to supplement that money with a scholarship from a second sport in order to receive a full scholarship. Currently, student-athletes may not have this opportunity if their primary sport has reached its full scholarship maximum.

Once again, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee asks you to remember that the passage of this legislation will allow for more opportunities for student-athletes in Division II, an important part of what makes our division attractive to potential and current student-athletes. Thank you.

**Bernard Franklin** (Virginia Union University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I want to speak in support of Proposal 27. As you've heard previously, this proposal is about simplifying our legislation and making it consistent with our philosophy. It's also about trusting each other.

Is there a way to hide players with this proposal, with the motive being to maximize equivalencies while gaining a perceived advantage in one sport or another? That can happen. Is there also a way for this to happen with the current legislation? Absolutely.

This concept allows additional participation opportunities and allows for the efficient use of our scholarship resources. The Legislation Committee has committed to the Presidents Council to monitor the effect of this proposal and amend it if necessary. I trust they will do that.

The 1 percent of our membership that wishes to ignore the intent of the legislation and operate outside the parameters of the legislation that the membership has adopted will do just that, regardless of what the rules are. When this happens, that 1 percent will have to answer to the Committee on Infractions and to the other 99 percent of the membership who are playing by the rules.

Let's adopt Proposal 27 for that 99 percent. It is good deregulation.

[Proposal No. 27 was adopted as amended, 98-51-0.]

### **Playing and Practice Seasons – Individual Skill Instruction**

**Fred Jacoby** (Lone Star Conference): We move Proposal No. 29.



Currently, in sports other than football, only three student-athletes are permitted to participate in individual skill instruction at any one time in a facility.

This proposal, if adopted, will enhance student-athlete welfare by allowing them the flexibility to participate in skill instruction with the number of student-athletes appropriate for their sport. Many skill instruction sessions are more efficiently and effectively conducted with four, rather than three student-athletes.

We urge the Convention's support of this proposal.

**Kimberly Jones** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Mississippi University for Women): I represent the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports Proposal No. 29, Playing and Practice Seasons – Individual Skill Instruction. This piece of legislation would enable the individual instruction to be done in pairs, which will allow the allotted time to be used most efficiently.

In most sports, many drills that are utilized to improve skills, require several individuals to run properly. This proposal will promote opportunity and welfare to all student-athletes. However, we do not support any further increases beyond four individuals. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 29 was adopted.]

### **Men's Championships – Sponsorship Criteria – Minimum Period**

**Lisa Colvin** (Southern Arkansas University): I serve as the vice chair of the Management Council and the chair of the Championships Committee.

On behalf of the Championships Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 30

[The motion was seconded.]

Current legislation specifies that championships may be established in a men's sport if at least 50 institutions sponsor the sport. Legislation may be proposed after the sport has met the minimum requirements for two consecutive years.

In order to be gender equitable, I urge you to adopt Proposal 30 in order to standardize the minimum period for both men's and women's sports.

At last year's Convention, the membership overwhelmingly adopted Proposal No. 20, which now enables legislation to be sponsored to establish a women's championship during the first year that the minimum sponsorship number exists. This proposal would make the same changes for men's championships. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 30 was adopted.]

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** This is the end of the presidential grouping. The remaining proposals that we will have will be paddle votes.

I would like to remind you that the results of the roll-call votes will be posted on the bulletin boards outside the ballroom when del-

legates return from lunch. You should see Jim Watson if you have any questions about the vote results.

We will now break for lunch, and reconvene promptly at 1 p.m.

We have one announcement.

**Clint Bryant** (Augusta State University): I had an emergency phone call when the resolution was made on my behalf. I would like to apologize for not being here. I wanted to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation for the expression that you made to me. I certainly appreciate it. Thank you.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** Thank you, Clint. (Applause)

[The meeting was recessed for lunch at 12:02 p.m. and reconvened at 1:14 p.m.]

## Monday Afternoon, January 8, 2001

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** Would you kindly take your seats?

The meeting is now reconvened. At this point in the Convention, we open the window of reconsideration for those proposals in the Presidents Council grouping. This will be Proposals 10 through 30. Any delegate who voted on the prevailing side of any legislation within the Presidents Council grouping considered earlier today may move for a reconsideration at this time.

We have a list of the votes by institution, so we have a record of those institutions that voted on the prevailing side and may ask for reconsideration.

This is a debatable motion. It requires a majority vote to reconsider.

### Recruiting – Telephone Calls

**Peter Chapman** (Missouri Western State College): I voted against Proposition 13. I would like to move for a reconsideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Ms. Styles Johnson:** We are now open for discussion on the motion to reconsider Proposal No. 13.

**Jerry Hughes** (Central Missouri State University): I would like to urge the delegates to reconsider this matter from the standpoint that it is permissive legislation. As I said this morning, this will allow us to treat our students who have signed NLIs and students who signed financial aid agreements with our institution in the same way.

With the traditional period, you're talking about the student-athletes who might sign, probably after the traditional period of February or late April. It is not an issue, I don't think, to be controlled. But it's an issue that we can treat those athletes in the same way as we get information to them on registering for school, on making calls about residence halls, those type things.

Additionally, I agree with my colleague, Jim Fallis. There are a variety of ways in which this can occur today. But if you think they are going to be abused, you do have to sign something to be abused. I don't think it is an abuse. I think it's fair treatment of student-

athletes.

From the institution's standpoint, if a student-athlete signs a financial aid agreement with us after the NLI window has closed in the spring, that financial aid agreement is only binding to the institution. True, the student can sign two or three, but the student doesn't have to honor it. We, the institution, do have to honor it.

We have committed our dollars and find they are not coming to us, we need to know that. I think the one call per week, as a compliance issue, causes us some concern. Thank you.

**Christina Kaesebier** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Drury University): I'm representing the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

Again, I want to reiterate that the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly opposes this legislation. We feel that unlimited phone calls for any reason — unless we have signed a contract saying that we are committed to one institution — are intrusive to the prospective collegiate student-athlete's personal life and may impair the decision-making process.

Student-athletes can sign numerous offers of admission or financial aid that are not binding contracts and allow various institutions the right to make unlimited phone calls.

The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee opposes Bylaw 13. Thank you.

**Ralph McFillen** (Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association): I understand the issue on the student-athletes' side. Any time a young man or young woman signs an agreement to go to an institution, particularly in the nonathletes, there is no limit on the number of phone calls they can receive. So why are we going to treat the student-athlete differently?

The point was made earlier about multiple signings. I would assume that if I made multiple signings, there is a consequence to that. If I signed with several schools, then I have some obligation to receive phone calls from different schools.

But I think there are enough issues regarding financial aid, regarding admissions or regarding the registrar, that the monitoring of those calls is extremely difficult. It's something that we really don't need to burden our staff with at this time. I think it would be good to treat these in the same light with the NLI and the institution financial aid.

**Ed Harris** (West Texas A&M University): I have great respect for our student SAAC group. They have worked hard on this. I know it's been an issue for the last couple of years.

The only thing I would say is that none of what we're doing here restricts you from having several different applications out. Knowing what a lot of different schools are interested in doing with you, this is saying that once you've accepted an agreement for admission or an agreement for financial aid, then that school that you accepted that with can make multiple calls.

I really don't see the ethics of accepting multiple financial aid agreements. Maybe somebody can explain that to me.

**Stephanie Harris** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Saint Leo University): I'm not going to address what Mr. Harris is addressing. However, when we're talking about unlimited phone calls with a National Letter of Intent, maybe what we should be doing is looking at putting restrictions on the unlimited phone calls with the National Letter of Intent instead of adding additional unlimited phone calls altogether if you don't have a National Letter of Intent signed. That's what the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is saying right now.

**Steve Murray** (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): It seems this morning we passed a great deal of legislation in favor of student-athlete welfare. Now we have the student-athletes who are negative toward this legislation. I strongly encourage us to follow the position of student-athletes on this issue and take this as a student-athlete welfare issue, as they have clearly stated throughout the day.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** Any other comments? This is a paddle vote on a motion to reconsider Proposal 13. We're ready to vote. We need to vote by machine. It will take them just a few minutes to get ready.

We have a slight programming problem. I'm going to ask all of the members of the Voting Committee to come to the front of the room. While we're fixing the technical problems with the assistance of the committee and the staff, we will have to hand count the paddle votes. Will all members of the Voting Committee please assemble?

If you would kindly take your seats and listen very carefully. We have three individuals who are members of the Voting Committee. One person is going to count this side. When they finish, they will give a signal and we'll ask you to raise your paddles and then put them down. This section will then be counted. Then you would raise your paddles and put them down. The same would happen over here.

This is the motion to reconsider Proposal No. 13. We'll get a total to you in just a moment.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 22 was defeated, 109-127.]

The window for reconsideration is now closed. I'm now going to begin our votes on proposals, beginning with No. 31. These are all paddle votes.

### **Amateurism – Educational Expenses**

**Anthony Capon** (University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown): On behalf of the Amateurism Project Team, I would like to move Proposal No. 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

Some prospects receive educational expenses to attend a preparatory school for the purposes of achieving the necessary requirements to satisfy NCAA initial-eligibility requirements.

Our current legislation precludes prospects from receiving finan-

cial aid from an individual upon whom the prospect is not legally dependent if the relationship with the individual has even a slight athletics nexus. Furthermore, prospects cannot receive assistance from any outside sports team or organization based in any degree on athletics ability.

The project team believes that Division II prospects should be able to pursue educational efforts. However, the project team recognizes that some sources of aid remain impermissible, which is why this proposal does not allow funding from a sports agent, a professional sports team or organization, or representative of an institution's athletics interests.

I urge your support of this proposal.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** After consultation, we will vote first on the effective date.

[Proposal No. 31 was adopted, effective immediately.]

### **Recruiting – Publicity**

**Dede Allen** (University of Alaska Anchorage): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 32.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is intended to eliminate the prohibition against athletics department staff members announcing high school, prep school and two-year college contests.

In Division II, such a prohibition should not apply to noncoaching staff members and preclude such individuals as the sports information directors and athletics directors from gaining outside employment through broadcasting opportunities.

To be consistent with other previous deregulation proposals, it also makes sense that this only apply to coaches on a sport-specific basis and only while under contract with a member institution.

I urge your support of Proposal 32.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** A point of reference on this particular proposal. If the delegates pass this proposal, then Proposal No. 33 will be moot.

[Proposal No. 32 was adopted.]

### **Eligibility – 10-Semester Rule - Joint College/High School Programs**

**Mary Gardner** (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 34.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is intended to specify that a prospective student-athlete would not utilize a semester by enrolling in a joint college/high school program unless the individual practices or competes for the college athletic team.

Recently, there have been situations in which prospective student-athletes have triggered the start of the 10-semester clock by

enrolling in a joint college/high school program in which concurrently they were technically eligible for the college athletic team but did not participate.

Current legislation requires that an administrative review subcommittee waiver request be approved to avoid using a semester in these situations. This proposal would amend the legislation to state that a semester would be used only when the individual practices or competes with the college team.

I urge you to support Proposal 34.

[Proposal No. 34 was adopted.]

### **Satisfactory Progress – Missed Term Exception**

**Kelly Higgins** (University of South Dakota): On behalf of the members of the North Central and Pacific West Conference, I move Proposal No. 35.

[The motion was seconded.]

Colleagues, I want to tell a quick story like Clint did.

In the 1970s, a very good friend of mine, a great baseball player, had two goals in his life: To play major league baseball or drive a Budweiser truck. To that end, he stayed eligible to play baseball four years at a very good university and completed approximately 50 hours of credit. That was possible at the time. I know, I completed very few over that myself at one time.

With all the efforts made to focus on academic requirements, it's still possible to play four years in championship competition and only complete 60 hours. My friend still drives his beer truck today. By all accounts, he's happy with his life. But is that what we've worked for all these years?

This proposal adds to that minimum. But in doing so, it gives student-athletes who are forced to miss one semester of school or are unable to take or pass enough hours at one time an opportunity to get that fifth year.

Currently, many Division II schools cannot offer that fifth year of aid for student-athletes unless they are still eligible to participate. Removing an exception for first-year student-athletes only was created to benefit the student-athlete's ability to compete and enhances the ability of our student-athletes now to graduate.

I believe this is clearly a student-athlete welfare issue, and I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 35 was adopted.]

### **Two-Year College Transfer Eligibility – Two-Year Nonparticipation Exception**

**Leon Kerry** (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 36.

Proposal 36 is intended to add an exception for the two-year transfer in an effort to make consistent transfer exceptions for "2-4",

“4-4” and the “4-2-4” transfers. This is a reasonable exception to the normal transfer of residence requirement and should be available to two-year transfers in the same manner that it is available to the “4-4” and “4-2-4” transfer student-athletes.

It is important to note that, like the nonrecruited student exception and a discontinued nonsponsored sport exception for a two-year transfer, this exception would not be available at any time to partial qualifiers or nonqualifiers.

I urge your support of Proposal 36.

[Proposal No. 36 was adopted.]

#### **“4-2-4” Transfer Eligibility – Nonrecruited Student Exception**

**Ross Brummett** (Carson-Newman College): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 37.

[The motion was seconded.]

Like Proposal 36, this proposal is intended to add an exception for “4-2-4” transfers in an effort to make consistent transfer exceptions for “2-4”, “4-4”, and “4-2-4” transfers. This is a reasonable exception to the normal residency requirement and should be available to “4-2-4” transfers in the same manner it’s available to “4-4” transfers and two-year college transfers.

It’s important to note that this exception, similar to the nonrecruited student exception for two-year transfers, includes a provision that the student must have been admissible to the certifying institution when he or she transferred from the original four-year institution.

I urge your support of Proposal 37.

[Proposal No. 37 was adopted.]

#### **Eligibility – Penalty for Ineligible Participation or Receipt of Improper Aid**

**Kathleen Heitzman** (San Francisco State University): On behalf of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is designed to prohibit student-athletes from escaping reinstatement conditions by transferring to a second institution.

Currently, violations of Bylaws 10, 12, 14, 15 and 16 follow a student-athlete when they transfer since the crux of the student-athlete reinstatement philosophy aims to restore the student-athlete to the position he or she was in prior to the violation occurring.

Currently, if the student-athlete is involved in a violation of Bylaw 14.3, which is initial eligibility, and subsequently transfers, the student-athlete’s ineligibility status does not follow him or her to the second institution.

For example, if a student-athlete received athletic aid at her initial institution and her qualifying test scores subsequently canceled, making her a nonqualifier, the reinstatement condition would

require the student-athlete to repay the impermissible aid. However, if the student-athlete were to transfer to a second institution, she would escape this reinstatement condition of repayment of impermissible aid.

The Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee believes the adoption of this proposal will allow the committee to continue to place student-athletes back in the position they were in prior to the violation occurring, and reduce the incentive for student-athletes to transfer for violations of initial-eligibility legislation.

I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 38 was adopted.]

### **Financial Aid – Course**

**Robert Heiny** (University of Northern Colorado): On behalf the Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is intended to permit institutions to provide only those course-related supplies that are required as set forth on the course syllabus. In many courses, required items such as art supplies and calculators are a larger cost item than books.

This legislation would allow institutions, if they wish, to assist student-athletes with these potential high-cost items as long as the supply is required, just like a required textbook.

If the books and/or supplies are provided, a figure of \$400 would still be placed in both the numerator and the denominator for purposes of calculating a student-athlete's equivalency value. This proposal would not change how equivalencies are calculated.

A proposal similar to this was considered in an Association-wide vote at the 1996 Convention and defeated. Division II should consider this without the input of the other divisions.

I urge your support of Proposal 39.

[Proposal No. 39 was adopted.]

### **Permissible Academic and Support Services – Day Planners.**

**Sue Willey** (University of Indianapolis): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 40.

[The motion was seconded.]

Current legislation prohibits institutions from providing organizational planners to student-athletes.

Day planners can be extremely beneficial to student-athletes in helping them to organize their busy schedules and keep track of all of their appointments and assignments. Considering all of the additional time demands placed upon the lives of student-athletes by their participation in athletics, it would be beneficial for institutions to provide them with a simple organizational tool to assist them in time management.

This should not be a huge price tag. Planners can be inexpensive, simple products developed and produced in the university printing



center or by the printer normally used by the institution. The legislation prohibits purchase of elaborate, expensive, commercially produced planners.

I urge your support of Proposal 40.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** A note on this particular proposal. We must first vote on whether to establish an immediate effective date for the proposal, and then we will vote on the merits of the proposal as amended to include an immediate effective date.

**Kelly Higgins** (University of South Dakota): Just a point of clarification. I believe this is fairly good legislation. I do question the ability or the desire to keep it only on an in-house printing basis.

It will probably cost me twice as much if we were to print this at the University of South Dakota, when I can order it for \$6.25 a piece. Just a point of emphasis.

[Proposal No. 40 was adopted, effective immediately.]

### **Contest – Football – Texas Bowl Exemption**

**Fred Jacoby** (Lone Star Conference): We move Proposal No. 41. [The motion was seconded.]

Currently in Division II, only 16 football teams qualify for the national championship. We're trying to provide student-athlete welfare and try to bolster the experience to more students. All we want to do is provide an opportunity.

All members of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference and the Lone Star Conference would continue to participate in the Division II football championship, if selected. This game would involve only teams not selected for the Division II football playoffs.

We think it has merit in providing postseason experience for our students, and we urge your support of the proposal.

**James Fallis** (University of Northern Colorado): Just a couple of questions.

Since the other piece of legislation also deals with that same conference, do you know which one goes where first? Is there any consideration as these start to come up for the records of those teams? I understand that the Rocky Mountain Conference's fourth-place team historically has had a better than .500 record. But my question is what happens when two go to the NCAA and then two are selected? Is there any consideration or concern that conference team may have a losing record? I just wondered if that was discussed.

**Mr. Jacoby:** In Division I, you'll have as many as five and six institutions playing in bowl games. We don't see anything wrong with having a second team play in a postseason bowl game. That would be worked out between the two conferences.

Even better yet, I hope a year from today we can see deregulation of this bylaw to provide the opportunity for any two conferences to get together to have a postseason bowl game.

So in answer to Jim's question, that is to be worked out.

[Proposal No. 41 was adopted.]

## Contest Exemption – Football – West Coast Bowl

**Michael Swan** (Humboldt State University): On behalf of the Pac West Conference and the Columbia Football Association, I move Proposal 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Proposal 42 is to permit teams from the Pacific West Conference/Columbia Football Association in the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference to participate in the West Coast Bowl beyond the legislated end of the playing season and to exempt such participation from the maximum number of contests.

In line with the Division II goal of expanding the postseason experiences for student-athletes, Proposal 42 achieves this Division II goal at no cost to the NCAA. In addition, Proposal 42 is consistent with existing legislation that allows postseason bowl contests in the sport of football. This game would involve only teams not selected for the Division II football playoffs.

I urge your support of Proposal 42.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** There was someone at Microphone 8. Did that person not wish to speak?

**Robert Hartwell** (Adelphi University): Actually, I don't want to speak on this. We had a question on the voting on Proposals 39 and 40. We were wondering if they could be reconsidered and counted manually. Both 39 and 40 seemed to be very, very close.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** After we finish with these votes, we'll have a motion to reconsider.

**Kelly Higgins** (University of South Dakota): I have a question about these exempted events. Is there some sort of review of these events? I am not personally opposed, but in my previous position, these events had to be certified, reviewed and thoroughly discussed. Is there some review of these? What actually happens at the events with the finances, et cetera? That's just my question for Bob.

**Bob Oliver** (NCAA Staff): Currently, there is no review process for exempted events in Division II.

**Mr. Higgins:** I would suggest that we need one if we're going to have more and more exempted events. I assume that obviously sometime in the near future, if we keep down this road, that every football conference will have one. We then start taking away from what is the intent of the championships.

I'm not opposed to them. I think this is great. I played football in college. I loved playing a lot of games. I just think if we're going to do this, we have to do it the right way and have some sort of review.

**Mr. Oliver:** Kelly, this may be more than you want to hear, or the membership in Division II wants to hear, but Division I, in its certification process for certified exempt events, is moving in a direction of eliminating certified exempt events in sports other than football right now. There's a proposal to make all events count one for one that are not conference championships or NCAA championships.

I'm not sure Division II wants to start down that road of certification for exempted events. I guess I would advise you to seek some legal counsel and some advice from NCAA legal counsel as to where that goes, relative to certification of postseason events.

[Proposal No. 42 was adopted.]

### **Enforcement – Penalties for Major Violations – Division II**

**Larry Blumberg** (Washburn University of Topeka): On behalf of the Committee on Infractions, the committee nobody wants to meet with, I would like to move Proposal No. 43.

[The motion was seconded.]

Although current legislation allows for forfeiture of a broad-based revenue distribution as a penalty in major infraction cases, current legislation does not allow for the imposition of fines when an institution has been found to have a major violation of NCAA legislation. However, fines are an option in secondary cases.

The Committee on Infractions can recommend to the Championships Committee that in cases of ineligible participation in championship competition, an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the institution's share of championship revenue distributions, in excess of the regular expense from redistribution, be withheld. If such funds have been distributed, the institution may be required to return such an amount.

Although this has not yet been an issue in Division II, the legislation has proven to be problematic in Division I. The Division I Championships/Competition Cabinet has pointedly expressed its reluctance to be involved with issues related to financial penalties. The Division I Championships/Competition Cabinet contends that it's not a fact-finding body. It is much more appropriate for the committee to determine the appropriate financial penalties.

The process is further complicated by the fact that the conferences equally share the revenue from all sources during the course of the year. Therefore, the ownership of revenue from championships is often unclear under conference revenue sharing formulas.

Therefore, the Division II Committee on Infractions proposes that rather than withhold the distribution of broad-based revenue or recommend to the Championships Committee the withholding of championship revenue, it be allowed to impose fines in major infraction cases.

This proposal will allow the Division II Committee on Infractions to impose reasonable financial penalties and thus provide an appropriate and viable penalty option that exists in secondary infractions that should be an option when major violations are found.

[Proposal No. 43 was adopted.]

### **Change of Division Membership – Championships Eligibility**

**Ms. Styles Johnston**: On this particular proposal, you're looking at the possibility of an immediate effective date. We must first

vote on whether to establish an immediate effective date for this proposal, then we'll vote on the merits of the proposal, itself.

**David Brunk** (Northeast-10 Conference): On behalf of the Membership Committee, I would like to move Proposal No. 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

The inclusion of championship eligibility in 2000 NCAA Convention Proposal 47 was inappropriate. The original intent of that proposal was to adopt legislation for reclassification from Division II to Division III that mirrored the legislative requirements that apply when reclassifying from Division II to Division I.

The Membership Committee discussed further the issue of inclusion of championships eligibility in this process as it precluded activity and agreed that retaining eligibility for Division II championships when reclassifying to Division III does not create a competitive advantage. This is a student-athlete welfare issue that deserves reconsideration by the membership.

The Division II Membership Committee urges your support of Proposal 44.

[Proposal No. 44 was adopted, effective immediately.]

### **Resolution: Senior Woman Administrator**

**Barbara Schroeder** (Regis University): As my final official duty as a Management Council member, and on behalf of the Division II Management Council, I would like to move Proposal 45.

[The motion was seconded.]

This resolution addresses a priority under the Division II Strategic Plan to enhance the role of the senior woman administrator at the institutional, conference and national levels. This will be the focus of the Division II Project Team to Review Issues Related to Diversity during the upcoming year.

The SWA should be a key voice in administration and governance of an institution's athletic program. However, in Division II, more than 50 percent of the SWA positions are now filled by coaches or clerical staff.

As we make a commitment to develop the SWA role on the national level, we ask that institutions and conferences make this a commitment as well.

On behalf of the Division II Management Council and Project Team to Review Issues Related to Diversity, I urge your support of this resolution and the commitment it establishes. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 45 was adopted.]

**Ms. Styles Johnston**: There was a question earlier about the reconsideration of a particular proposal. At this time, we can reconsider any proposals not in the Presidents Council grouping.

**Robert Hartwell** (Adelphi University): We're concerned about the counting. Whether you want to debate the issue any further or not doesn't matter to us, but we would like to have a manual count on 39 and 40 if possible.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** I'm going to turn to our Parliamentarian.

**Parliamentarian Lawrence Fitzgerald:** Bob, any request for a recount or revote has to be made before the next proposal is introduced.

The only way that we can do a revote on 39 and 40 is if you were on the prevailing side and you moved to reconsider those proposals and then the proposal for reconsideration is passed. That would be the only way that we could revote on those at this time.

**Mr. Hartwell:** I wasn't on the prevailing side, otherwise I wouldn't be up here. So I guess I can't do that.

**Stan Aldridge** (Georgia College & State University): Just a point of clarification.

When we passed Proposal No. 36, part of the discussion stated as I understood it that this legislation did not apply to nonqualifiers and partial qualifiers. I don't see that written anywhere in the legislation.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** I refer to Jim Johnson.

**Jim Johnson** (NCAA Staff): Stan, those exceptions are in the introduction part of that. There is language there that any of those exceptions can't be used by a partial qualifier or nonqualifier. It is in the Manual. It's just not part of this draft of this proposal.

**Mr. Aldridge:** Thank you.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** I'll ask once more, is there anyone else who wishes to reconsider these proposals?

The period of reconsideration has closed.

There's a couple of things I need to bring to your attention at this time. For the good of the order, are there any concerns or issues that the membership would like to comment on at this time?

**James Fallis** (University of Northern Colorado): Could somebody explain next year's selection of Indianapolis as a Convention site? I was under the understanding that the Convention site was to be below the 39th Parallel. Why we are going to Indianapolis?

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** Mike Racy will respond to that.

**Mike Racy** (NCAA Staff): It's a wonderful city, and we have a wonderful new building to show off to all of you.

The Executive Committee last spring was provided a recommendation to eliminate the rule or Convention policy that you've been talking about. So next year it is Indianapolis.

The Executive Committee was excited that the elimination of that rule also allows us the opportunity to perhaps have future Conventions in San Francisco and other states where we haven't been able to have it in the past.

We have our fingers crossed for beautiful, sunny, 50-degree days.

**Ms. Styles Johnston:** Like today.

I would like to update you on the discussion that took place yesterday at the Presidents Council and to share with you a recommendation that the Presidents Council will be making to the Executive Committee tomorrow. I and Bernard Franklin, as your representatives, will be providing this recommendation. This is in regards to the

Confederate flag issue. If I could just have your attention for just a minute, I want to make certain that you understand the position that's being taken and for me to have an opportunity to listen to you.

The Division II Presidents Council strongly opposes the hosting of all NCAA championships and playoffs following the 2000-01 season in states that officially display a flag that contains an image of the Confederate flag.

Division II membership institutions in South Carolina, Mississippi and Georgia that earned championship sites will be asked to comply voluntarily with this resolution, effective with the 2001-02 playing season.

The Division II Presidents Council calls on the NCAA's Executive Committee to be proactive in examining the Association's role and addressing issues regarding the principles of nondiscrimination outlined in the NCAA Constitution.

Since we will be reporting on this tomorrow, we felt very strongly that at least the membership should know what the leadership of the division is recommending to the Executive Committee tomorrow.

Are there any other items of concern that you would like to bring forth at this time?

This is my last meeting in the capacity of chair of this division. I still remain on the Presidents Council, but not in an official position of leadership. I want to thank all of you immensely for giving me this really awesome opportunity. It is one that I have enjoyed. I am really more than pleased with our division. I expect that in the future under the leadership of Patty Cormier and other members of the Presidents Council, that Division II will continue to thrive.

I look forward to seeing you in beautiful Indianapolis next year. The meeting is adjourned.

[The Division II business session was adjourned at 2:21 p.m.]

# ■ Division III Forum

## Sunday Afternoon, January 7, 2001

The Division III Issues Forum was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with Presidents Council Chair Ann Die, Hendrix College, presiding.

### OPENING REMARKS

**Ms. Die:** Good afternoon and welcome to this afternoon's Division III Issues Forum. I'm Ann Die, president of Hendrix College and chair of the Division III Presidents Council. Joining me at the dais this afternoon are a diverse group of individuals whom you will hear from in a few minutes as part of this afternoon's panel. I will ask the panel members to wave as I introduce them, please.

[Note: Individuals on the dais were introduced.]

This is the fourth year we have conducted a Division III Issues Forum on Sunday afternoon at the Convention. Each year, we have focused on issues that are of particular importance to our student-athletes, and we have involved our student-athletes directly in our presentations. This is consistent with our division's strategic plan, which places special emphasis on issues of student-athlete welfare and membership education. Of course, this also is consistent with our division's philosophy statement, which places the highest priority on the overall quality of the student-athlete's educational experience. This year's format is no exception. In fact, it is an issue that involves all constituents on our campuses and conference offices. Today's forum will focus on building positive relationships between student-athletes, coaches, faculty and administration.

This is our first forum to involve individuals from each area of our athletic team. With the help of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, we have identified subtopics that I know will capture your interest over the next two hours. My thanks to the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and our Convention Planning Committee for its help in this regard.

Based on the success of last year's forum, we have seated you at round tables in order to foster greater dialogue and interaction. This year, we also have attempted to seat a student-athlete or a member of our Management Council at each table to ensure our discussions are as relevant and beneficial as possible.

You will be given the opportunity to come to the microphone and address issues later in this program. I now am happy to introduce my colleague, President Jim Appleton. Jim's in his 13th year as president of the University of Redlands. Prior to his appointment, Dr. Appleton was vice-president for student affairs and vice-president for development at the University of Southern California. Dr. Appleton currently serves on several boards and commissions outside the University

of Redlands, including two foundation boards. Jim is no stranger to the NCAA. He served for many years on the Presidents Commission, co-chaired the Division III Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure and was a member of the Division III Management Council. He received his undergraduate degree from Wheaton College (Illinois) and his Ph.D. from Michigan State University. We are pleased Jim agreed to provide us with thought-provoking opening remarks and serve as facilitator for today's discussion. President Appleton. (Applause.)

## FORUM PRESENTATION

**James Appleton** (University of Redlands): Thanks a lot, Ann. I think we should take every occasion possible to thank you for your leadership on the Council. I've asked Ann whether she would continue next year as president. She said this is her sunset year. There will be several occasions to say thanks, but I think we ought to also say thanks now. (Applause.)

This is one more of the advantages of federation, in my view. We have the opportunity to focus explicitly on some of the things that are important to us. This topic — building positive relations among student-athletes, coaches, faculty and administration — is a very good one in the process of implementing our philosophy of athletics within Division III. I've looked forward to this; I hope you will.

I will make some remarks and we do have a panel. We also have most of the afternoon. After our remarks here, we will engage in conversation and some actual workshops at the tables. There will be opportunity for me to intrude on that process from time to time and get some folks to see how far along they are in looking at these issues on your own. We'll see if we can gain from this process this afternoon.

It sure is stating the obvious to say that the following is consistent with our philosophy: Athletics at our institutions are not primarily for spectators. They are not cash cows. They are not primary ways for us to build our public images, they are not an add-on to our institutions. Our athletics, done right and well, should be an integral part of our educational mission. The important lessons learned on our fields, courts, tracks and pools are at the core of our educational enterprise. Moreover, NCAA restructuring and our federation gives us the opportunity to focus on these kind of matters from time to time when we get together, even if we did lose some influence on the NCAA overall. That's just a personal statement. But I would guess that our influence was a bit exaggerated even in those days.

To state a principle as simply as I know how, the development of educated persons should be at the core of our athletic programs. I would not deny this is a value in Divisions I and II. But for us, it should be intentional and should be explicit. Among the characterization of an educated person, cited by William Cronin in a recent issue of *Liberal Education*, are these statements: "Educated persons listen and they hear. They can solve problems and understand how to



get things done. They respect rigor. They practice tolerance and self-criticism. And they nurture and empower people around them, this being the mark of true leadership.”

Contributing directly to these qualities fits, in my opinion, exactly with our athletic philosophy. The development of these characteristics can all be influenced by quality athletics programs being run consistently with our Division III philosophy.

Let me repeat them. Educated persons listen and hear. We need this on good teams and in our programs. They can solve problems and understand how to get things done. Our athletic programs contribute to that. They respect rigor. They practice tolerance and self-criticism. And they nurture and empower people around them by leadership qualities.

I can go a step further. Our athletics programs become even more integral to our academic missions when they not only influence directly these qualities of the educated person that I have cited, but when we encourage — and I’d even say insist — that our students strive to develop the other qualities of the educated person that Cronin cites in the following: “Educated persons read and understand. They search deeply for meaning. They can talk with anyone with genuine interest in the other person. They can write clearly and persuasively.”

I think contributing to the development of educated persons with these credentials is our charge as coaches, athletic administrators, faculty athletic representatives and presidents just as much as it is the charge of our faculty.

Now, I’d like to have you squint your eyes for just a minute or two. If you do that, you can conjure up the names and faces of people from your campus, students who were greatly influenced exactly in this direction through your athletic programs.

In this age of educational assessment, many of our institutions are finding ways to measure how well we’re doing. But for today, stories are good enough. Think of a story that you can bring quickly to your mind about your athletic program inspiring a student to become an educated person. Examples from the University of Redlands often flood my mind.

Jose. Jose lived in a car with his mother as a senior in high school. He was on a full-need financial aid package at the University of Redlands. He graduated in four years. He was a football all-conference tackle. He’s a high-school science teacher in the Los Angeles area. He looks to what happened in the classroom, but he also looks to what happened on the athletic field as contributing to him being an educated person.

Rob was a national merit scholar and all-conference basketball player. He continued to say that the leadership qualities he learned on that floor were as important as the classroom. He went to Chicago law school. He’s an attorney, and he’s on an alumni board.

Juan. Juan came to the university a very angry man with great

ambition. He was my advisee as I taught a freshman seminar class. He told me recently that there are three people at the University of Redlands who are most important in his life because of the lessons he's learned. One, the director of his academic program, who happens to be sitting to my left; two, me as president; and three, his offensive coordinator coach. Juan is going to be an educated person. The classroom as well as the athletic field are going to contribute to that.

Robin, also an advisee of mine, was a star tennis player. She learned great lessons through the sport, but decided to stop because it was more important for her to do other things to contribute to her education in her senior year at the University of Redlands. It was best for her future. It's also a Division III phenomenon that is not seen at many other kinds of institutions.

Again, if you squint your eyes, I bet you can think of many, many, many students who fill this kind of example. It is our task, in my opinion, to be very deliberate in figuring out how our athletic philosophy can be implemented on our own campuses and how athletics can contribute to educated persons.

During these two hours together, we want to think concretely as a team of faculty, administrators, coaches and students on our campuses about the implementation of best practices. I would like to share just a couple of examples — actually a few — that come to my mind. These are ideas that are important to me in implementing this team in our contributing to educated persons. My colleagues on the panel will add some of their very good ideas.

Then we're going to work together. You will develop some action plans that help all of us in this room.

Here are just a few of my thoughts that I'll only cite but not elaborate on them. Then I'll turn to my colleagues. At the top of my list is that the president, the athletic director and the faculty athletic representative must meet regularly, not just at crisis times. I think there are two things that we ought to pay attention to outside of individual cases. One, how is our institution implementing a mission statement in athletics that will contribute to educated persons? Two, ask this question: How can we ensure at our institution that we are not becoming Division I "wannabes?" It's pretty tempting. But that's not what we ought to be about.

Two, each institution must develop a philosophy of admissions and campus life that does not set the athlete apart from the student body. This does not necessarily argue against different admissions at some of our most selective colleges. As president, I have never made an admissions decision and have not directed that one be made for the purposes of athletics. That seems right for my school.

Three, we should espouse in Division III a full range of athletic opportunities. In this regard, I think the number of sports teams required by our division before membership in Division III is too narrowly defined. But irrespective, our institutional aspirations should exceed the minimum number and certainly should provide equitable

opportunities for both men and women.

Four, we should insist on strict adherence to the NCAA practice and game requirements and should argue for even further accommodations to academic schedules even beyond the regulation. At the University of Redlands for example and not to be presumptuous, football practice on Tuesdays is in the evening because our labs go late on Tuesday afternoon. At the same time, I will admit I don't feel very good in relation to our principles that I have reluctantly allowed our golf team to play dual matches rather than scheduling four teams at once to limit the number of full afternoons for matches.

Five, the allocation of financial aid must, without question, be applied in the same manner for athletes and nonathletes. Each of us as presidents must insist on some internal review of our policies and procedures to be sure this is true. We will be dealing with this as a division tomorrow and in the days ahead. But whether or not we have a clear mechanism for NCAA monitoring of this complicated situation, it is on our shoulders to ensure that we are providing financial aid without consideration of athletic promise.

Six, and last, involvement by the CEO with student-athletes, as well as theater majors and musicians and student leaders, will add to the culture of our campuses. Each president, of course, must develop his or her own style in implementing this. For me, just as one example, I have the opportunity every year to accept the invitation of our football coach to address the 100-some football athletes. My message is brief. I talk about their academic program. I ask them to care for each other as a multiethnic group of students and to model behavior on the campus. I make sure they understand that I am counting on them as president to set the pattern for a healthy, drug-free campus. I emphasize how much they can influence the entire tenor of the campus and how much I really must depend upon them. It's always interesting to me how this opening in the fall produces year-long dialogues with so many of these athletes.

So much for a few of my ideas. Let's see what inspiration we can draw from the experiences of our panel about building positive relationships and using athletics to contribute to educating students. I'm going to introduce in pairs. We're going to start with students. We ought to start with graduates who have just left the student ranks and have a lot to say to us.

First of all, an all-conference member of the Whittier College football team — that beat Redlands in the championship a year ago, but he's such a nice guy — Dewayne Barnes also served as a student athletic trainer, a member of the Whittier student-athlete mentorship club, and vice-chair of Whittier's Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Dewayne received a bachelor's degree in physical education and recreation with an emphasis in athletic training in May 1999 and currently is pursuing a master's degree in education at Whittier.

Amy Huchthausen is a 1999 graduate of the University of

Wisconsin, La Crosse, where she was a two-time captain of the softball team. While in school, she was a member of the campus SAAC, serving as chair for two years. She also was a chair of the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. The past two years, she has served as a SAAC representative to the Management Council. She is currently an assistant director of compliance and championships at the Missouri Valley Conference.

These two students will kick off the panel remarks. Dewayne, give us a start.

**Dewayne Barnes** (Whittier College): Thank you, President Appleton. It is the belief of the student-athlete that the relationships between themselves, their coaches, the faculty and the administration should always be a positive one. It is also the belief that the relationship between the coaches, faculty and administrators should be smooth and cohesive. In fact, these relationships can be testy at times as competitive as we are on the field. This can do more harm than good for the student-athlete. Far too often, practice times and class schedules conflict with each other and the student-athlete is placed in a position to choose between their academic and teammate loyalties.

Division III has always considered academics to be the number one priority and see themselves as student-athletes in the truest sense. However, is it fair to place the student-athlete in a position to be forced to make a decision such as choosing between these two situations? Certainly not. Student-athletes need to feel comfortable asking for help. We need to know exactly where to go and who to ask. Three major points I'd like to go over concerning this issue are, one, the ideal; two, reality; and three, the compromise that needs to be made.

First, the ideal. All parties need to have an open-door policy. All parties make themselves available to the student-athlete and all parties are approachable and can keep confidentiality.

Second, reality. These people are chosen to fill these roles for a reason. They possess qualities and skills to efficiently get the job done. They are very busy and they have a long list of things to do and can become overwhelmed at times.

Three, the compromise. Student-athletes must be patient and ask for help in a timely manner. Similarly, the faculty, the coaches and the administration also needs to offer help in a timely manner. The student-athlete needs to be involved in decision-making processes so they know exactly why decisions are made about them and why the answers are handed to them.

In conclusion, hopefully these issues can help the relationship between student-athletes, coaches, faculty and the administration to become a more positive one and remain so. Thank you. (Applause.)

**Amy Huchthausen** (University of Wisconsin, La Crosse): Each group here today is equally responsible in the development of positive

relationships. But the group that is most affected and most influenced are the student-athletes. The key to ensuring that student-athletes enjoy, rather than endure, their experience is to provide a healthy and open campus environment.

The first step is a commitment to simply want the relationship. To most, it should be an inherent concept; however, I'm certain we can all identify individuals who lack a desire for it to exist. In my experience, most student-athletes are eager to form a relationship with their professors and to adhere to our responsibility of being students above all else. Frequently, professors are willing to work with a student-athlete so expectations on both sides are met. Unfortunately, not all possess that willingness and, as a result, student-athletes suffer.

Of course, this goes both ways. The commitment to creating a positive relationship must be established by everyone for it to flourish. The critical factor in any relationship is communication. Open lines of communication must exist within the campus environment. The development does not happen overnight. It is a process that requires both patience and tolerance. It should be proactive rather than reactive. Student-athletes have taken the initiative over the years.

The goal of the NCAA Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee since its inception in 1997 was to see every institution form a campus SAAC. Last year, we went a step further and urged conferences to also form committees. In both instances, the Division III membership was responsive and supported our endeavors. Forums such as this are a perfect example of Division III's commitment to the student-athlete.

Perhaps the most difficult phase in building positive relationships is the cultivation. Interaction must occur more often than just when problems arise. The relationship must extend beyond an hour in the lecture hall or two hours in the batting cage. Positive relationships are produced over time. A senior usually has a stronger relationship with a coach versus a freshman simply because a trust has developed over the years. The instructor on a first-name basis with the student-athletes has a connection. Trust enables you to be honest in discussions and thus more effective.

Many elements go into an ideal relationship. What can specifically be done to ensure that a relationship is positive? Frequent interaction between administrators and student-athletes is important. Having administrators present during SAAC meetings to talk with, rather than talk to, is beneficial. Student-athletes appreciate when administrators attend games or practices. We realize presidents are extremely busy individuals, but attending just one game speaks volumes to student-athletes of the level of support the university possesses. It's easy to rally around a Saturday afternoon football game, but what about the Monday afternoon soccer match or the Thursday night wrestling meet? Those events are equally important.

Reflecting upon my experience as a student-athlete, I realize I was very fortunate. Our chancellor took time to discuss the legislation with me. Our AD and associate AD had open-door policies that allowed me to share concerns I had with the coach. While most faculty athletic representatives are relative unknowns with the student-athlete population, I had the chance to befriend ours. I had the opportunity to participate in the positive relationship and team environment that existed at the University of Wisconsin, La Crosse. I cannot imagine that my experience could have been more rewarding or enjoyable.

This is a response we wish every student-athlete were able to give when asked about his or her experience. What are your student-athletes saying? Take the initiative and be responsive to your student-athletes. You'll most likely then meet the challenge of building a positive environment in which everyone can share in providing an exceptional experience for all student-athletes. Thank you.

**James Appleton** (University of Redlands): I think the students deserve applause. (Applause.) Sometimes you like to be known still as students. Sometimes you like to be known as graduates, right? Thanks for that student perspective.

Some time ago, I suggested in a staff meeting when we were debating some matter that was of great student interest, that everyone in this meeting leave and go out on our campus to find 10 students, ask them the question about this issue we were debating and come back. It wasn't a random sample, but there were eight people in the room and that's 80 responses. It kind of reemphasizes your point, Amy, about getting out and talking with students to get the real picture. It's not a bad tactic.

Let's get the faculty on this team. Dr. Kathryn Springsteen will soon leave Colby-Sawyer College in New London, New Hampshire, where she has been the chair of the natural science department since 1977. She will assume the position of vice-president for academic affairs and dean of the faculty at Wilmington College in Iowa. From 1996 to '98 she served as acting academic vice-president and dean of the faculty at her institution. Kathryn is also a visiting scholar at the Harvard School of Public Health and Occupational Health. She received her bachelor's degree in chemistry from Marshall University and her doctorate from West Virginia University.

Second, Dr. Christopher Walker. It's kind of fun to introduce Christopher on campus. He's professor and chair of our department of communicative disorders at the University of Redlands. He's been the faculty athletic representative for the past 14 years. He's previously served as the Division III vice-president of FARA and is chair of the Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. Currently, he is serving as a member of the Division III Management Council. A speech-language pathologist by profession, he specializes in the treatment of individuals who stutter.

Kathryn, if you would get us underway again, please.

**Kathryn Springsteen** (Colby-Sawyer College): Thank you. It's probably not surprising, when following the students, that I've also chose to talk about communications. Even at small institutions communication can be a real problem. Sometimes we assume that because we all know each other, we know what is going on.

For faculty, often communication with students concerning missed classes is of paramount importance. This situation had created issues at Colby-Sawyer that resulted from a breakdown of those communications, even though we had a well-thought-out written policy. Faculty were always informed of the athletic schedule and team membership by the athletic department, and students were required to speak to faculty prior to missing classes. So what was happening? Since students knew that faculty knew about the schedule, they felt that a quick "I won't be at class next time" was all that was really necessary. Faculty wanted to have a real conversation with students about what they were missing and what could be done to keep up with the work.

So what did Colby-Sawyer do about this? First, our athletic director met with the academic vice-president and the department chairs for a frank discussion of the problem. I was a department chair at that time and participated in the meeting. But if I had not been a chair, I would think that the faculty athletic rep should be at such a meeting. The group made several suggestions about communication that were then taken back to the athletic department for their input.

At this point, our athletic director worked with our academic dean to develop a written form that students would bring to each faculty member at the beginning of the term. The form needed to be filled out with the conversation between the faculty member and the student. We are going to require that a copy of that conversation go back to the athletic department and to the coaches involved. That way, we hope we will all know that a real conversation took place right at the beginning of each season.

We're just starting to put the system into effect. At the present time, it seems very cumbersome, at least to me. We'll need to simplify it a little in order for it to be used effectively. We might be able to use technology such as e-mail to help simplify the reporting process and to get the word out more quickly. But we do hope that the presence and the existence of a written form will help us to identify other problems such as excessive absenteeism at a time when we can work to resolve these issues.

This is obviously just one example of a breakdown in communication, and these occur among all constituencies on campus. It's important to be open to discussing how to improve communication and how to keep everyone informed.

**Christopher Walker** (University of Redlands): Getting faculty on the team. That's certainly an important question. From my perspective, faculty is at the core of the team, not the athletic team, but the core of the education team. That's the team we should be talking

about in Division III. How do we get faculty on board? By understanding the faculty view.

As a faculty member, I come at athletics from a slightly different viewpoint. God knows I support athletics. I do. Athletics is a wonderful thing for many of our student-athletes. When a former student-athlete arrives on my campus with questionable academic skills, I don't talk to their athletic director, I don't talk with their former coach, I call the faculty from that institution. I want to know what happened. The faculty are the people who have the responsibility for ensuring that these students leave our institutions as truly educated individuals.

When a student is having difficulty at their first job after college because of poor academic skills, being an all-American in baseball begins to lose some of its luster. When the parents come to visit me at my office as department chair, they're not talking about the value of athletics in education, they want to know where the breakdown occurred in education. They hold faculty responsible. They hold me responsible. Faculty are the ones given the responsibility for shaping critical thinking skills, problem solving, for guiding discourse in writing. These are the skills needed for our culture.

That's what the faculty believe and that's the faculty view. Faculty are where the rubber hits the road relative to why students spend four years of their life in college. Trust me, I recognize the wonderful benefit of athletics and that we have some student-athletes who would never reach a college campus just by virtue of academics alone. It's athletics that drives them sometimes.

But for the vast majority of our student-athletes — and I might also say for their parents — they've come to college for four years for the education. That's the faculty view that's got to be accommodated if we're going to get faculty on the team. If student-athletes don't walk across that stage at graduation or they go into the workplace with weak academic skills, no matter how great their athletic experience was, we have all failed as educators. We are all responsible.

Now, let's apply this back to you and athletics. First, faculty believe academics must come first. Hopefully, we can work that out in the majority of circumstances. But, in fact, if it can't be worked out, academics has to come first.

Secondly, faculty expects student-athletes to respect the classroom and that opportunity for learning. Many of you in this audience have an important role to play in that. It makes a difference what the coach says about academics. It makes a difference what the senior woman administrator or athletic director might say.

Thirdly, faculty expect to be informed in a timely manner concerning anything that will affect the presence of a student in their classroom or the student's academic performance.

How do we satisfy these faculty expectations? As a faculty rep, I recommend that our student-athletes identify themselves proudly to faculty as student-athletes the first day of class when they're going to



need accommodations. When they do that, they must make clear that academics are important and that they will satisfy all the requirements of the class to the best of their abilities. They should state that they were recruited to this institution with the expectation of being able to have quality experiences in both athletics as well as academics, not having to choose between them, as Dewayne talked about. If this is done during the first week of class, we've satisfied the faculty expectation of being informed in a timely manner.

Maybe I'm naive about these things, but I believe 99 percent of the faculty in Division III institutions don't want to stand in the way of a student-athlete and a quality athletic experience. I believe if you give faculty enough lead time and student-athletes pursue their class with a reasonable level of academic vigor, the faculty member will work to adjust tests, assignments and missed classes to the benefit of the student-athlete.

The keys are trust and communication. Trust, if the department of athletics recognizes that academics is at the core of our common goal of educating these student-athletes and that they communicate that message to student-athletes on a regular basis. Secondly, trust that the department of athletics will do everything they can to ensure good communication between student-athletes and faculty. When that trust exists, then the faculty will be on the team. That's the faculty view. (Applause.)

**Mr. Appleton:** Thanks to all of you and to the panelists. I'm giving Bridget the credit, incidentally. After the next two speakers, I'm going to ask any of the panelists who have spoken thus far if they want to add to the comments that have been made. But now we'll get to the athletic administrators on our team.

Susan Bassett has been director of athletics at Hobart and William Smith Colleges since 1995. She is a graduate of Ithaca College and holds a master's degree from Indiana University. As a former swimming coach, she coached over 100 all-Americans, three national champions, and was named the 1993 national women's coach of the year. Under Susan's guidance, they continued to have one of the nation's most successful women's athletic programs.

Secondly, Al Bean, who's currently the director of athletics at the University of Southern Maine. A member of the Division III Management Council for the past four years, Al has served on several NCAA committees, including the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. A former teacher and baseball coach, he is also past commissioner of the Little East Conference.

I'll turn to my two colleagues, athletic administrators. Susan first.

**Susan Bassett** (Hobart and William Smith Colleges): Thank you. Good things always come from interaction and collaboration between athletic department staff and faculty. Professionals in athletics, both coaches and directors, must constantly reinforce that we are educators first and foremost and partners in the educational

enterprise. As highly visible leaders on campus, directors of athletics have the unique opportunity and responsibility to demonstrate a partnership between academics and athletics.

Please consider the following guides for conduct: visibility, involvement, accessibility and knowledge of student-athlete academic achievement. Directors have a pivotal function, one toward student-athletes, one toward faculty and administration, and one to the community at large. Opportunities arise toward student-athletes through student-athlete councils, attendance at contests, individual team meetings where we can embellish the business of NCAA forums with articulation of expectations about academic progress and how we expect them to conduct themselves in class. Teach time management.

Prepare students for the challenges of balancing academics and athletics. To faculty, administration, staff, and students — and I recommend the same for coaches — attend campus events, lectures, music and dramatic productions, academic awards ceremonies, unique campus activities. Be there, participate, be visible. Attend and participate in faculty meetings and initiatives. Be involved in campus-wide committees. Volunteer and participate in community speaking opportunities. Include messages about academic achievement and education through athletics.

Perhaps these are things you already do. If so, great. How about your coaches? If these are things that you used to do but have gotten away from, how can you get reinvolved? Further, and most importantly, be armed with statistics on academic performance of student-athletes both in and out of season. Trumpet academic achievement by student-athletes. Know the effect and the impact of athletics on the recruitment and retention of students on your campus.

Demystify athletics. Break down barriers through accessibility and involvement. Assure everyone that coaches are professors of excellence, teachers of team work, commitment, integrity, respect, sportsmanship. Coaches wear many hats in students' lives as counselors, advisors, coaches, recruiters and teachers. State what is to us the obvious: Through athletics participation, a student's educational experience is richly enhanced.

**Al Bean** (University of Southern Maine): I think early on in the process for a lot of students it's critical that they make a connection. For many of these people, that support group or that group that they feel comfortable with can make the difference for them whether they'll be successful or not.

If I've learned anything over the last few years — which may be debatable — I know that students are coming to our campus and other campuses with a lot of issues, a lot more than they used to have. It could be family relationships, divorce, alcohol and drug issues, eating disorders, issues of sexuality, clinical depression, and the list goes on. I think it's getting more complex as time moves on. For some, it's just being away from home for the first time or just

needing some attention. Those first six to eight weeks for that person who's away the first time can be a very, very difficult time and one where they need to find a friend, where they need to find a connection.

I think in athletics we can help with that process through our coaches, through our administrators and working with other students. Students need to know that we respect them, that we care about them, but that we also have expectations of them. I think that needs to be played out very early in the process.

They need to know if they have a problem that they think is going to reflect upon them, the department, the institution, they need to come to us and talk about it and deal with it up front. And I think we're all bright enough to know that students 18 to 22, or whatever it may be, will have problems. They're there, they're experimenting. But it's how they deal with those problems and how we as an institution and staff work with them to deal with those problems that's critical.

Three years ago, we had the good fortune of having the chance to build some new facilities. Perhaps the best thing that we've ever done is to build a learning center and study area directly in the middle of our athletic offices. Our students are there every day working, studying, using the computers, even checking their e-mail. They get to interact with people in a number of ways by doing that. We also have assigned two staff members — and we're very fortunate that they're upstanding people — whose job is primarily to relate, work and meet with those people on a regular basis and to get to know them and begin to build those relationships of trust.

I think it's also important that perspective comes in not only from administrators and coaches, but I hope by faculty. As we look at students today and the many demands they have, sometimes we can think that that hour in the classroom or that two-hour practice is the most important time in their life. With some of the things they have going, we should probably all realize that they're going to have their peaks and valleys as well.

I would encourage folks to build those connections. Use your students and your staff to be creative, to get involved. Also use your SAAC members. They can be integral in mentoring those young freshmen as they come through the door. Thank you.

**Mr. Appleton:** Thanks to both of you. (Applause.)

My dean of students not too long ago said to me that for some of the students coming to the University of Redlands, this may be the best home they've ever had. But I'm sure on the other hand, there are many, many students who come from homes where their home is the best home they've ever had and Redlands is just a university to attend. But that comment from her struck me very much about the important role that we have in the orientation, in the introduction, in making students feel like they belong at our place. Al, some of your comments reminded me of that.

Before moving to coaches, how about any comment from any of the panelists at all? These comments have been so complimentary. Anything you'd like to add to any of the features that others have noted? Anything you want to add? Well, let's go on then.

**Dewayne Barnes** (Whittier College): I just want to note something that Chris said. I think it's very important for student-athletes to go to class that first day and identify themselves as student-athletes. We know we're going to have some schedule conflicts at some time. I think you can't respond in a more timely manner than that first day in class in saying you're a student-athlete. We can take that back to a lot of our conferences and our own SAACs.

**Mr. Appleton:** There's a sense of reality but also a sense of pride, it seems to me, in that as well. Coaches, it's your turn.

Christa Racine is currently in her seventh year as head women's soccer coach and assistant athletic director at Drew University. She holds a USFA license and serves as an instructor for the New Jersey Soccer Association Coaching School. She is a graduate of Rutgers University where she majored in English and was a varsity soccer player for four years. She earned her MA in administration and supervision from Montclair State University.

Second of all, Sara Wakefield, a former standout student-athlete on the nationally ranked Bluffton College volleyball team. While at Bluffton, Sara served on many campus sports committees and also helped develop the student-athlete advisory committee. She graduated with a degree in mathematics in 1998. Sara recently accepted the position of instructor and head volleyball coach at Bluffton University and is pursuing her master's degree studies in developmental kinesiology at Bowling Green State University.

Christa and Sara, take this for me, if you would.

**Christa Racine** (Drew University): It's been said many times already that the premise behind any successful relationship is communication. I feel that over the years, the major communication between coach and athlete has changed quite a bit. More responsibility has shifted onto the coach, making them more accountable for the success of the relationship with each individual player. In the past, many coaches had a "my way or the highway" type of philosophy for their team. If you don't like it, this is how we do things. Tough.

But the coach today needs to play a much different role. They need to be accountable for maintaining open lines of communication between themselves and athletes from various backgrounds. This all begins with your recruiting process. During this time, a coach develops a relationship with the prospective student-athlete. It is the coach's responsibility to paint a realistic picture for the prospect as to what their career may be like; what the coaching staff would expect from them during their four years at their institution; and how they would like to see themselves as a player. It is extremely important that a coach ask a prospect what they want to get out of their four

years playing for you. Simply asking this question can determine whether or not this prospect belongs at your institution. What they may want to accomplish at your institution may not be possible to attain while playing in your program.

The coach is also accountable for learning more about the prospect as an individual person. Do you feel that as a coach you can motivate this individual? Even if it may mean that you need to take a different approach than with your other athletes? Does this individual have things in the proper perspective, especially how it relates to the Division III philosophy?

When I ask myself these questions when I meet with a recruit, it helps me help them grasp the important lessons that are taught through participation in a sport, such as dedication, teamwork and discipline, just to name a few.

During the recruiting process, the coach is accountable for making sure the prospective athlete understands that open communication is extremely important. It is a known statement that coaches have a better rapport with their athletes when they as coaches initiate communication. This is done most effectively through one-on-one coach/player meetings that are initiated by the coach. This illustrates to each individual that you want to hear their feedback. It forces those players who are not vocal to have a voice. Too frequently coaches at the college level — a bit more at the scholarship level — do not take enough interest in the total development of their athletes.

In my opinion, every player who enters your program and understands the components of participation at the collegiate level should leave your program a better player. It is too easy to look past a current player in the program if they are struggling and bedazzled by the accomplishments and abilities of a prospective player. A coach has a commitment to helping each player obtain their ultimate potential. As it's been said many times already today, it is an educational process. A graduating senior should feel that their education has gone beyond the concrete walls of the classrooms at their institution. All of this needs to be communicated during the recruiting process, and the coach is responsible for doing so.

When I meet with a recruit, I tell them that they will become more in tune with the world, that they will develop as a soccer player, that they will improve their ability to communicate, and that they will receive a great education if they come to school with the desire to have those experiences. In my opinion, it demonstrates that I am being accountable for the coach/player relationship and that I value the importance of that relationship, that I believe in the philosophy of an educational sport experience, and that I am sensitive to the combination of that sport experience with a rigorous academic program.

**Sara Wakefield** (Bluffton College): As Christa has said, one important line of communication on our athletic teams is between the coach and the athlete as an individual. What should not be over-

looked, though, is the importance of communication between the coach and the team as a whole and the role of the coach in facilitating effective communication between the team members.

Many of us don't know of all the communication that takes place between members on our teams. We encourage our athletes to keep it on the court or keep it on the field when issues or conflicts arise. In most cases, this is good advice and the team functions without our intervention. But there are times when we can and should step in to facilitate the process of working through team member differences.

As a coach, I feel the pressures of planning practices, preparing for games, giving my attention and feedback to more than 12 girls at one time, teaching responsibilities and all of those little things that arise from day to day. When I realize or am made aware of a communication problem on my team, I rarely feel that I have time to deal with those on an individual basis. But each year, I discover more and more of a benefit to taking the time to work through these things right away.

Instead of just being a mediator or go-between for the parties involved, trying to smooth things over or offering a temporary solution, I have attempted to be a facilitator of discussion, urging individuals to say what's on their mind and asking questions to get to the real heart of the problem.

Last fall, a situation involving miscommunication arose between several members of my team. My initial reaction was to just let them handle it themselves, to keep it on the court. But it was soon obvious that the problem was affecting our practices, our games and the chemistry of the team. I didn't want to just speak about it to the team as a group because just telling them to forget about it could cause further problems later in the season. Instead, we had an open discussion with the entire team. I facilitated this by asking questions to encourage these women to take care of the problem right then.

By this type of communication, I believe both the team as a whole and the individual women benefitted in several ways. A new understanding was reached between them, a better knowledge of what is okay and not okay on the court. Since this didn't just come from me, it had a much greater importance and impact on them. But more importantly, they gained a reinforced idea that direct communication in times of conflict not only works, but builds a greater trust between those involved and ultimately a better relationship and a better team.

I am certain that this experience and similar experiences that are likely to occur as I attempt to lead the team in their communication will be tools for these women to use as they graduate and start their careers.

**Mr. Appleton:** Thanks to you two as well. (Applause.)

I'm assuming you would covet having that kind of perspective for every coach. When you're on the job, this really helps to be up here like this. What I'm reminded of by your comments is how important

the role of mentoring for the athletic director is. If there are coaches who come into our programs and might not have the wisdom that the two of you have just shared, it really is a responsibility of the athletic leadership to spend the time and help mentor our coaches.

We've come full circle. Back to students. I'm going to introduce Megan Stevens, who competed in Cortland State athletics since August 1997. As a freshman, she already was a multisport student-athlete participating in lacrosse and soccer. She has served as co-chair of the Cortland State Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Megan currently serves as a member of the NCAA Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. She plans to graduate with a degree in recreation management and a minor in tourism in May 2001.

Following Megan, we turn to conference leadership. Carlyle Carter was hired in 1994 as the first conference administrator for the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. Prior to that, he served nine years as director of athletics, intramurals and recreation sports for Penn State's Commonwealth Campus System. Carlyle has served on several NCAA committees, including the Division III Management Council and many others. He currently serves as a member of the Division III Initiatives Task Force representing Division III commissions.

Following the presentation of these two, get ready, it's your turn.

**Megan Stevens** (State University College at Cortland): I am truly proud to be a Division III student-athlete. As a student-athlete finishing my college career, I can take a look back and reflect on my experiences. The choice I made to attend a Division III institution was based on the fact that I wanted a chance to be a well-rounded student, including being a student-athlete. Academics came first but sports and other extracurricular activities soon followed.

This total student philosophy is what makes Division III student-athletes unique from other divisions. While most of us still eat, sleep and live our sports, it is important to be in an environment that allows and encourages student-athletes to engage in many different types of activities. Being exposed to different opportunities helps student-athletes interact with administrators, faculty, coaches and other students.

In my personal experience, I was motivated by a number of on-campus constituents to participate in a variety of athletic and nonathletic activities. The relationships I formed with administrators, faculty and coaches sprang from my involvement in all such activities. For example, my work in the office of admissions allowed me to communicate with faculty and other administrators to recruit and educate prospective students. As an academic peer mentor in the residence halls, the opportunity provided me one-on-one experiences with a diverse student body. Experiences such as these are what made my college career so great.

The environment on the Division III college campus should be

one that provides all student-athletes with a well-rounded college experience. A positive relationship with administrators, faculty, coaches and other students will come through a broad-based participation. Thank you for a wonderful, rewarding Division III experience.

**Carlyle Carter** (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Association): Good afternoon, everyone. That was pathetic. Good afternoon, everyone. Much better. You know, we've become a much more impersonal society with e-mails, voice mails, faxes, videos and chat rooms. Back in my office, I probably have a stack of about 50 e-mails waiting for me.

At the Division III level, we've been all about inclusion, not exclusion. We've seen that in a number of forms, in our committee make-ups, the Management Council, and designating sports for gender spots and minority spots, and just a number of inclusive types of structures in our committees. As a Division III conference administrator, my role is that of facilitator, one who solicits and moderates the will of all constituents that I serve: the presidents, the faculty representatives, the athletic administrators, the coaches, as well as the often-forgotten student-athletes. All have a role to play in what we do. But in many situations, the students are the forgotten element in what we do from the standpoint of input.

We've heard a recurring theme throughout today's discussions about communication. Back in my the day, communication was what someone said to you, not necessarily what you had to say to them. That's a lost art. We've forgotten how to talk and more importantly we've forgotten how to listen.

As for involving students, our fears perhaps are the demands that they may place on better box lunches, newer uniforms or better travel conditions. But in fact, our students we know have a much more important agenda. They have a lot more important things to say. We're very proud of our student SAAC organization in the Division III national level as well as our conference SAACs and our individual institution SAACs. Sometimes we forget to listen. Sometimes we forget to include them. Communication is a two-way street. It's not only speaking, but it's also listening.

It's my belief that in order to build more positive relationships between the constituencies, communication is the key. Through the additional requirement of establishing a conference SAAC, we've got a window of opportunity to strategically plan for the inclusion of this all-important group in the planning of what we do. Communication builds understanding and that understanding will lead to building more positive relationships between our student-athletes and all who serve them.

In our conference, we developed a strategic plan a few years ago. The number one element that we found we were lacking is communication from the conference to our members; communication between our members individually; and also a lack of communication



locally between our athletic departments and our faculty reps; our athletic departments and our coaches; and our students. It's my firm belief that you need to talk to your people and you need to allow your people to talk to you. Thank you. (Applause.)

**Mr. Appleton:** I'm amazed. We have set a record. How many sessions have you attended at conferences all across this country where it's intended that there would be discussion and opportunity to work together and then the speakers go on and on and on and on and that chance never comes?

We're asking you to stay together for one more hour. Because as our good leaders, Dan and Bridget, planned this session, it was intended that this panel and I would have just about this time to present individual ideas that we have on the topic and then we would ask you to gather in tables of six and eight and actually work for a little bit so that you can come up with some concrete ideas that throughout the rest of this hour you would be able to share with the group and collectively we'd go away with some terrific ideas.

Let me deal with logistics for a second. If you are at a table where you are a single institution and you don't have colleagues from other institutions, or you are at a table with two or three, when I say "go," you're going to go to another table. I know you will. I'm watching you.

Second of all, there are pages on each of the tables and there are four sub-issues. I'm going to cite the topics that are on those pages. One issue is "Assess campus and athletics department climate." How do you know what it's like and what might you do and specifics to improve it?

Two, "Eliminate negative athletics stereotypes." What could you do on our campuses?

Three, "Develop strong relationships with departments." Not only academic. Campus life, maintenance. Physical plan on campus. What can we do to improve that?

There's a fourth, "Enhance communication among student-athletes, coaches and administrators."

Four subtopics. We are going to ask that you take a look at those four and select one. Before the hour is over, select a second; I doubt if you get to all four. But I think around the room we would have each of those topics as you pick different ones. We would ask that you spend 10 or 15 minutes discussing that general issue, how you might develop some solutions or improve. Be as concrete as you can. What suggestions can you make from your own experiences? There are experts here — certainly more expert than on the panel — who will be able to add things to help us all.

During the afternoon, I'm going to ask two or three of the tables to report, to give us an idea of what's being discussed. At the end of the hour, we are going to collect the papers you have filled in — there will be a recorder at each of the tables — so that we can put this on the NCAA Web site and distribute the ideas that you have developed in this short hour for our entire audience.

[Note: The delegates discussed the issues then presented their ideas.]

**Leon Lunder** (Carleton College): We identified as a general issue communicating or promoting what our student-athletes are all about. I think that can be expanded to what our athletics department is all about. Methods of helping the community to see that the student-athletes are whole people, help to see that the athletic department is interested in what is going on in the college in general. I think these things can be done through community outreach, through attendance at various events on campus, the visibility of the coaches, athletes, and athletic administrators on campus in a variety of ways.

Also, for the athletes to learn when it is appropriate to be an athlete. I think that there are times when it's important for students to be an athlete and there are other times when it's important for them to be a student.

The other piece is that community service or involvement on campus is not just a one-time deal. You don't go out and do it once and hope it lasts for the rest of the year. We need consistency in being involved in various aspects of the campus as a whole.

The obstacle that we identified was student-athlete time. Trying to figure out how to make these things work within a student-athlete's time involved as far as class, practice and community outreach is an obstacle.

**Randy Arnold** (Huntingdon College): We picked up on the same idea — that faculty feel that student-athletes sometimes gain special treatment, especially with regards to missing classes. It's essentially a result of a lack of communication between coaches and faculty. If there could just be a line of communication, it would help resolve some of those problems. We came up with a few ideas and possible ways of getting a line of communication. One of those things is on certain committees, maybe on an athletic committee, to have a significant number of academic faculty and athletic coaches serving on the same committee so there's already a few lines of communication by serving on the same committee.

The second idea is something that apparently some places have done before where you might have an honorary coach for a day. Invite a faculty member to come down and sit on the bench with the coach and the team during one of their events during the year. Those were our ideas.

We had a number of suggestions, but the one I want to emphasize, because I think it is one that would be very helpful on our campuses, is to try to bring faculty to a realization of this problem as they come to the campus. We all have orientation programs for new faculty. Here is an issue that could be discussed at a moment like that. Try to bring to the table at that point the method in which this problem is going to be dealt with on this campus. Faculty tend to act as individuals. They come with past experiences. They may not understand

the climate at your institution as effectively as you would like at that moment. But you have an opportunity as they come to the campus to try and develop the campus climate and culture related to this kind of an issue.

**Carl Bibbs** (Bennett College): Our subject was developing strong relationships with departments on campus. What we came up with was the general issue was separation of departments. Too often the problem is the separation of departments where people are not known by each other. Faculty have no respect or understanding of what coaches go through; coaches have no understanding of education departments. So to kind of offset some of these, we talked about receptions, invitations, attendance at faculty meetings and athletic assistants working through the dormitories.

I'll talk about each one of those. For receptions, our student-athletes could invite their professors and their teachers to the games so that they would have more of a connection on that end. That's also part of the invitations we discussed. The student-athletes and the coaches would involve as many of the faculty as possible in the athletic events that were going on. Attendance at faculty meetings by SAACs as well as the coaching staff was one idea. The athletic assistants working in the dormitories was another one.

We were discussing the fact that at one of the schools, they actually have their assistant coaches going in and working with the dorm directors or the dorm assistants in case there's a student-athlete who has a problem in the dorm or if there's just an athlete who has a problem in the dorm who wants to talk to a different adult. Those are just some of the issues we discussed.

**Donna Ledwin** (New Jersey Athletic Conference): We dealt with the same topic. One department that we had common concerns about was the relationship with the maintenance department on campus and balancing requests for services with limited resources. A lot of miscommunication may occur. For example, when you make a request and the maintenance department is trying not to spend their budget knowing athletics has a lot of money from student fees and whatnot. They're trying to get you to pay for garbage cans and toilet paper, things that should be provided generally. We focused our attention on those kinds of issues and just getting things accomplished in general.

We came up with a couple of thoughts. Number one, focusing on health and safety aspects of a task that you want accomplished. It's perhaps easier to say no to a request if it seems to be an aesthetic issue or not a burning priority. But if you throw health, safety or liability into the conversation, people's ears tend to perk up a little bit.

Getting student input. Sometimes I can walk in with the same request as an athletic director to our maintenance director three weeks in a row and they don't seem to hear you. But I really think that upper administration is attuned to the student, in responding to them. So sometimes a different voice saying the same thing can get

the attention. I think our student-athletes can make a difference when they participate in the process.

Also, along the lines of the gentleman who stood up before, don't make assumptions that people know what priorities are in your day. For example, give them calendars or schedules on when you'd like things done. How many maintenance workers out there — most of them are male — have ever played field hockey? So if they say they cut the grass on Tuesday, you've got a field hockey game on Thursday, everybody knows grass can grow pretty quick in the warmer months and the field is really not ready, it would need to be cut again. If you can spell out a little more specifically what your needs are and specifics of a schedule, I think that can help meet your needs and give them a little more direction.

**Mr. Appleton:** Thank you. Part of the relationship we don't always think about on that side. A couple of principles seem to come out when we're talking about communication and these relationships. One, assume that the other people are good people and would help if they knew what was going on. And two, assume they don't know an awful lot. Put those two things together and it helps a great deal.

I wonder if the panel members who have been listening and who had only a chance from the podium to give one strong idea have another idea to add or a perspective they'd like to share before we move towards the end. Any of the panel members want to add something?

**Christopher Walker** (University of Redlands): One thing I wanted to mention is the talk about change. I remember a time 20 years ago when I first began teaching that I had a student in my class, and he had some conflict. So he didn't come to the class. I worked out a deal with him. He got the notes and all the other stuff and the guy got a 4.0. I'm like, "What am I doing with teaching?" Well, those days are over. Many presidents, including this one, are saying you've got to teach differently. We're talking about active learning now; no more passive learning. So this issue keeps surfacing with missing class. I know it's an important issue. But it's a very important issue to faculty.

You see, things are changing. Because now what we do in class is discuss issues. That's how learning takes place. It's no longer, "I'm going to give a lecture," it's no longer focused on reading a book. The more the student-athlete is gone from the class, the more the faculty member feels that becomes a real problem because there's no way to make that up.

I would just encourage all of you to consider that. I know there are going to be times when student-athletes just can't make it to class. But I think it becomes a problem if we look at the scheduling. Some faculty advisors will say don't you dare tell that student not to take a class in the late afternoon because of athletics; they must take the class. Well, it's a conflict. Am I going to be able to do both? I said

earlier, we're not going to force students to choose — that's what Dewayne said — between athletics and academics. We've got to avoid that, which means we've got to be better at scheduling classes so that there's not a conflict so the student is going to be gone from class a lot.

**Megan Stevens** (State University College at Cortland): I wanted to ask that everyone here — presidents, athletic directors, student-athletes — bring this back to your campus. Literally take mental note of exactly what we've discussed and bring it back. Discuss it with your SAAC. Student-athletes will have good ideas. I hope there's a student-athlete at every table. They do provide very valuable information. They think about things from a different perspective.

These are good ideas to bring to your SAAC. This is something you can give to them and say, "What are your ideas on this?" Also include faculty members and administrators with your SAAC. On my campus, that has been huge. Our FAR can come to meetings. Our athletic director came to about every other meeting. Coaches were invited to meetings. Keep that line of communication open and bring what we've talked about here back to your campus. If it stops here, it doesn't go anywhere. Hopefully, you'll bring it back and go from there.

**Mr. Appleton:** That's terrific. We're going to conclude in a very atypical way. We're going to work a little bit after the closing remarks of the person who's facilitating. My closing remarks are simply as follows: I think this is Division III at its best, where we see athletic programs to have the potential to be integral, to be central to our academic missions. Second of all, where we see as one of our objectives to help each other in implementing this philosophy within our given institutions, way beyond the wins and losses, even if we all like to win. Coaches like to win. We don't say, "Gee, coach, I hope you lose today." You know, that wouldn't go very far. But to take it beyond that as a measure of our success.

The second closing comment I would make is it most likely is very important because there are coaches, athletic directors, presidents and faculty who came into this business some in the '60s, some even in the '50s, some in the '70s, some in the '80s, some in the '90s. But this is 2001. Our students are different.

One of the things that's not been explicitly noted, which might be valuable, is it would be useful on our campus to have student life personnel or a person from our counseling staff come into our staffs with coaches and talk about the differences that our students bring to our campuses today. Who are our students? Coaches who began to coach in the '70s are not going to be effective as coaches working with students in 2001 unless they understand the differences between those students today and those who came in the '60s and '70s. It's a very different world. That mentoring may also help us implement our missions most effectively.

Third, thanks, Bridget Belgiovine, for giving us the leadership

and putting this together. Stand up, let us say thanks. (Applause.)

Four, my recommendation is that you continue at your table to the point where on at least one of these issues you have a full slate on both pages so that the facilitator at your table can pick them up, they can be edited and put on the Web. As we check the Web site in the weeks ahead, we can get lots of good, concrete examples of how to implement better relationships on our campuses and even more effectively help to educate our good students. So finish in that way, if you would, and thank you very much. (Applause.)

**Ms. Die:** I, too, want to add my thanks. Can I interrupt your work for one moment because I know you will finish at different times? It's a reminder that this year's Convention formally opens with a general business session at 4:30 p.m. right around the corner. Please remember also that the Honors Dinner will begin at 7:30. Everyone must have a ticket to enter as they will be collected as you enter. This will be different from former years, so make sure you have your ticket. For all chief executive officers in the room, the NCAA is hosting a reception from 6:30 to 7:30 p.m. Those are the rooms. Again, thank you and thanks to Jim Appleton. (Applause.)

[The Division III Forum was adjourned at 3:32 p.m.]

# ■ Division III Business Session

## Monday Morning, January 8, 2001

The Division III business session was called to order at 8 p.m., with Presidents Council Chair Ann Die, Hendrix College, presiding.

### OPENING REMARKS

**Ms. Die:** The business session is now called to order. Good morning and welcome to today's Division III business session. I'm Ann Die, president of Hendrix College and chair of the Division III Presidents Council. I will chair today's Division III business session.

Joining me on the dais this morning are Tom Courtice, president of Ohio Wesleyan University and vice-chair of the Presidents Council; Walter Johnson, director of athletics at North Central College and chair of the Division III Management Council; Truman Turnquist, faculty athletics representative at Mount Union College and a member of our Division III Management Council; Georgana Taggart, coordinator of paralegal studies and faculty athletics representative at the College of Mount St. Joseph, who will serve as our parliamentarian; Dan Dutcher, who serves as Division III chief of staff and keeps us going when the rest of us are back on our home campuses; Bridget Belgiovine, who serves as Division III assistant chief of staff and also helps staff the Executive Committee of the entire Association; and Chris Martin, who is a membership services representative at the national office and is our Division III legislative liaison.

Chris receives many phone calls from your campuses in order to clarify proposals, rules and regulations that are ambiguous to you. Chris will serve as our interpretive expert during our discussion of proposed legislation later today. We're very glad you're here, Chris.

Also joining us is a court reporter, Annisa Justice. She will help create an accurate and full record of our meeting.

Before I ask for a motion to accept the Notice and Program, I would like to point out that Pages 4 and 5 of the Program describe the various corrections and editorial revisions in the Notice. None of these is controversial in nature. However, we also will try to remind you of those corrections when we address the specific proposals. If we vote to accept the Convention Notice and Program, we will vote on the proposals in the order they appear in those publications. So if you wish to reorder a proposal, now is the time to do so.

**Donna Ledwin** (New Jersey Athletic Conference): On behalf of the New Jersey Athletic Conference, I move to reorder Proposal No. 50 ahead of number 48 and 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

While we understand the rationale for assigning Proposals 48 and 49 ahead of Number 50 to list more restrictive proposals ahead

of less restrictive proposals, we believe there are also substantive differences between the two proposals. For example, the allowance of captain's practices and the restriction of competition to the weekend are two important elements of Number 48 that set it apart conceptually from Number 50, more than just the many dates of competition or weeks of practice.

Taking these elements into consideration, the order can be viewed as a case of apples versus oranges. You can approve Number 50 without rendering either 48 or 49 moot. But the same cannot be said in reverse. We request the reordering to allow Number 50 to receive equal benefit of full debate.

**Jim Nelson** (Suffolk University): Chris, I'm going to ask whether 48 will in fact become moot should 50 be reordered.

**Ms. Die:** Chris, we're calling on you early in the day.

While Chris and Dan are conferring, let me remind you of how the vote will work. It will simply be determined by a majority paddle vote. Dan has a comment to make.

**Dan Dutcher** (NCAA Staff): Proposal 50 does not affect individual sports. It also affects only certain team sports. So Proposal 48 would still be viable in terms of the team sports not contained in 50 in terms of individual team sports.

**Mr. Nelson:** Dan, it would have a deleterious effect on 48, is that correct?

**Ms. Die:** He can't interpret your question. He asks for further elaboration. (Laughter.)

**Mr. Nelson:** I have a few remarks. I think it does have a negative effect, so let me make my remarks here that I would probably still make in the afternoon session. I think it has a significant impact on the reordering.

I have been reminded on a number of occasions since I have arrived at this Convention that I've appeared before you as some mythical figure —Don Quixote in the past, and also as your godfather, Don Corleone. It was suggested to me last night that maybe I should be Don Duck. I will pass on that. What you see is what you get.

While many of you were visiting the mouse in June at the NACDA convention and engaging in thoughtful dialogue on nontraditional seasons, my wife, son, daughter and I were backpacking through Spain, France and Italy for a month, reliving our hippie days. But do not despair. I have brought the slides along with you to share. The first slide is of my family and I before the Eiffel Tower. Do you have it up there? Well, I see they have not arrived.

**Ms. Die:** They have not been loaded.

**Mr. Nelson:** The next slide is one of the Pope with his arm around me.

**Ms. Die:** We don't have that one either.

**Mr. Nelson:** Let me tell you what he was whispering in my ear. He said, "Tell me, Jim, what has happened with the return to 64



teams for the men's and women's basketball tournament?" (Laughter.)

"Well, Your Holiness, it may take divine intervention for it to occur."

And he said: "I will see what I can do." For those of you who are quite familiar with my campaign to return to 64, I couldn't pass this opportunity. But that's for the future.

More immediately, our focus is now on nontraditional seasons. Having participated in a lengthy dialogue last year and rereading the transcript of all of the speakers, it is worthwhile noting the varying viewpoints. We first voted to eliminate competition in the nontraditional season with a vote of 158 yes, 155 no and five abstentions — a typical Florida vote. In the afternoon session, reconsideration of the morning vote prevailed, and a motion to refer finally was passed 192 to 143. You can't be any more indecisive than that.

Proposal 48 provides support and control for both game competition and practice opportunities necessary for the advancement of developmental skills of the student-athlete and, likewise, the evaluation and talent level of coaches, many of whom are challenged by climate and geography in the process.

Proposal 50, well intentioned by its authors, does not address the simple theme of the nontraditional season, that being unencumbered practice opportunities. The tentacles of the nontraditional season are very much in evidence in the daily practices as they can be with game competition: trainers and training room facilities, field or court schedule and maintenance, coaching staff priorities and time demands.

A concern has been raised that two practice opportunities may not be sufficient preparation for weekend competition, and my response is that this is the nontraditional season. If it is one's intention to have practice sessions unfettered, then let us eliminate the prefix in nontraditional.

The term captain's practice has also been mentioned as some concern. I answer that by saying if it sounds like a duck, looks like a duck, it is a duck. A scheduled practice is a scheduled practice regardless of the title pronounced upon it. You, as the ultimate source of scheduling our facilities, have the final determination of who, when and for what purpose you utilize your facilities. To incorporate liability as an issue of concern not to pass this proposal because of the term captain's practice, as has been inferred by the Management Council, I merely state: What are we not liable of?

The mere fact that the Management Council opposes the adoption of Proposal 48 may for some of our membership appear to be sufficient reason for casting a "no" vote. Or maybe it is not. I do hold a great respect for those who serve on our membership council, having been a national sports chairman for two years. I have discovered that not all decisions are unanimous and that committee viewpoints are as varied as their membership. Take, for example, Proposal No. 51,

the return of on-court basketball practice to October 15, a proposal that has the approval of the Management Council but a concept that has been inoculated to our membership the last several years. Opinions change. Composition of committees change. I can take rejection and still feel comfortable that any proposal that does not address limitations on practice opportunities is not in the best interest of nontraditional seasons.

Adopting Proposal No. 48 in its correct order moves us forward as advocates of responsible caretakers for all our constituents we are trying to represent. For that reason, I would oppose reordering the proposals. Thank you.

**Dee Fairchild** (Grinnell College): I am a member of the Management Council. On behalf of the Management Council, I encourage the delegates to oppose this motion to reorder. Both Proposals 49 and 50 change how in-season baseball and softball tournaments must be counted toward contest limits. The change proposed in Number 49 is more significant because it would require each contest in every tournament to count. The change in Number 50 would continue to permit multiple contests per day in one tournament to count as one, provided the tournament takes place during vacation or break time. Proposal 49 simply is the most simple and direct way to deal with the counting of baseball and softball tournament contests. The Management Council and Presidents Council both support Proposal No. 49 and believe it should be voted on before Number 50. Thank you.

**John DiBiaggio** (Tufts University): I'm a member of the Presidents Council. The Presidents Council also encourages the delegates to oppose this motion to reorder. The proposed changes, in our view, to the way baseball and softball tournaments are counted are more significant than Proposal 49 and should be voted on first. Not only does this make much better sense, but it is consistent with the NCAA Convention policies and with our prior practices. We would respectfully request that you defeat the motion to reorder. Thank you.

[The motion to reorder was defeated.]

**Ms. Die:** Please note that by adopting the Notice and Program, you are also adopting two legislative appendices found in the Convention Notice. One is the grouping of noncontroversial amendments in Appendix D, which starts on Page 141. There is one change to that grouping. Please note that the Management Council has withdrawn Proposal No. NC-23 on Pages 158 and 159 and referred it to the Championships and Women's Volleyball Committees.

The second legislative grouping is Appendix F and includes the modifications based on intent. It starts on Page 170. These amendments all have been approved by the Management Council and Presidents Council and published in The NCAA News. We will not discuss them individually unless you move to do so at this time. I see no efforts to go to a microphone.

I will now ask for a motion from the floor to approve the printed Notice and Program for the Division III business session so that we may proceed with our work.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Permit me now to review today's agenda and timetable. You should note that based upon your feedback, we have consolidated our business session into one day this year. Of course, we would like your feedback after this session concludes. This means that we have a very full day in front of us. Our job between now and 6 p.m. is to complete the Division III agenda identified on Pages 14 and 15 of the Convention Program. We will meet this morning until noon, at which time we will break for lunch. After lunch we will reconvene here at 1 o'clock and meet until 6 p.m.

The Convention Program identifies the specific discussion topics we will cover this morning and this afternoon. To review the morning for you, this morning we will receive the reports of the Presidents and Management Councils and hear from the Division III Initiatives Task Force and Amateurism Task Force.

We also will hear from the Interpretations and Legislation Committee regarding deregulation issues and the new legislative services database. We will conclude the morning with a report from the Financial Aid and Awards Committee focusing on Proposal Nos. 46, 46-1, and 46-2, which we will consider this afternoon. Careful attention to that particular presentation should help our voting this afternoon to go smoothly on that issue.

Please note that we will begin our formal consideration of legislative proposals immediately after lunch at 1 p.m. We have set aside a couple of hours for that important responsibility. We will consider a total of 32 legislative proposals and related amendments this afternoon. When that time comes, I will turn over the gavel to Walter Johnson, chair of the Management Council. Walter will review the necessary information related to our voting procedures and preside over our consideration of all of the proposals.

The first thing we will do after our break is open the window of reconsideration related to the legislation voted on earlier in the afternoon. Walter will handle that. As you recall, when we reopened the window for reconsideration last year, we had a proposal reversal. So that is an important time for you to be back in your seats and ready to vote. Once we close the window of reconsideration, we will spend most of the remainder of the afternoon discussing key championships issues, including the selection, posting and update on automatic qualification, which you will often hear referred to as "AQ."

We will conclude with the consideration of the slate of Management Council nominees for 2001. We have a full agenda and we need to stay on schedule. Please forgive my intent to keep us all on schedule. I will do so and do so fairly vigorously. I encourage you to be prompt when you return from lunch and your breaks.

If there are no questions regarding our schedule, I would like to

take this opportunity to speak to you as chair of the Division III Presidents Council on my thoughts and my views on the general state of Division III. It's a look back and it's a look ahead. I would like to take this time to review our state of affairs, what's gone on in the past, where I see us going in the future. This Convention will conclude my four years of service on the Presidents Council and a related two-year term of service on the NCAA Executive Committee, which oversees all of the NCAA's activities. It also concludes my two years as chair of the Presidents Council.

I think those of us in this division can be proud of what Division III has witnessed and accomplished during those four years since restructuring. Four years ago, we were still working our way through the final details of restructuring and nervously anticipating just what greater freedom and greater federation and CEO control would really mean for Division III. Four years later, here's where we stand.

There have been significant developments in the area of governance. We have a Division III strategic plan. We were the first division of the three divisions to create a division strategic plan. Division II created theirs later; Division I is still working on theirs. Our strategic plan is solidly based on our philosophy statement in Division III. The plan governs both the agendas of our committees and the allocation of our divisional resources. To receive support and funding for any initiative, whether it comes from membership initiative or an initiative of a Division III committee, that initiative must be based on the strategic plan, not on happenstance or whimsy or a certain thought.

I'm very pleased to say that we enjoy a solid working relationship between the Presidents Council and the Management Council. The Management Council has been very generous to let me sit in on their meetings. It gives me a heads-up on some of the issues that they are concerned about. It tells me the issues on both sides of the table of what the Management Council is discussing and I'm able to bring that discussion into the Presidents Council.

The division of labor between the two groups — the Management Council and the Presidents Council — is especially significant. The Presidents Council continues to focus on more of the big-picture issues like planning and major legislative and policy initiatives. It relies heavily on the Management Council to handle more of the arduous details.

The inclusion of two CEOs on the Management Council is a governance feature unique only to Division III, not II, not I, and it serves us well. You may not know that each member of the Management Council also sits on a Division III committee. So any committee recommendation that moves from the committee to the Management Council has an advocate already sitting on the Management Council who understands the issues. We also have a better relationship between the Management Council and our general committees. As I indicated, that seems to be based in a large part on the inclusion of

at least one Management Council member on each of our Division III committees.

We are also different from the other divisions in another way. Our student-athletes are directly involved in our governance structure. In addition to the important role played by our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, several student-athletes are members of general division committees and two student-athletes serve as full voting members on the Management Council. Division III remains the only division that has empowered student-athletes to this extent in its governance structure. I think we have been pleased with how successful this interaction has been for our division.

Championships issues have also been a key focus of the governance structure during the last four years. We now enjoy unprecedented championships access for our student-athletes. We expanded team sport brackets on an access ratio of 8:1 and have further expanded the ratio to 7.5:1

We also have significantly expanded access in individual team sports. Further, our championships access is more equitable. We have added a women's golf championship and have the opportunity to add championships in women's rowing and ice hockey with the adoption today of Proposal Nos. 55, 56 and 57. The adoption of this legislation, together with travel party increases implemented this past year, will mean that for the first time the number of men and women participating in Division III championships will be approximately equal. This is a significant accomplishment. I congratulate the Championships Committee for its hard work in helping make this a reality. Equitable, competitive opportunities are specified in our philosophy statement.

We have also enhanced the importance of conference and regional competition. I will repeat that because it is so critical to our philosophy and mission. We have enhanced the importance of conference and regional competition and made the selection of championship participants more objective with the adoption and implementation of automatic qualifier ("AQ") principles. Those who predicted the implementation of this legislation to be controversial have not been disappointed. Nevertheless, the Presidents Council and Management Council remain convinced that the selection of participants in team sport championships is now much more consistent with the principles of regional in-season competition and conference championships, which clearly is articulated in our philosophy statement. I encourage you to attend the update on possible refinements to the automatic qualifier, AQ, process later this afternoon.

While the past four years have been very busy, my intent is not merely a pleasant trip down memory lane. Many significant challenges lie ahead of our division and I would like to review a few of them. The first issue is greater CEO leadership and involvement. CEO leadership is one of the key tenets in the new structure. It has been one of the key tenets of the Knight Commission and now the

reformulated Knight Commission. Yet, it would not be honest to say we have achieved that goal.

Our structure empowers a limited number of presidents to head the Association-wide and divisional structures. Those CEOs cannot be effective without the support of their many colleagues on campuses. I urge each of you — athletics administrators, faculty members, conference officials and student-athletes alike — to communicate on a regular, ongoing basis with your presidents and chancellors regarding this important issue in intercollegiate athletics and to communicate to them about issues in general so they are informed about where our division is headed and what our major concerns are. Educate them. Challenge them. Encourage your CEO to become more involved in the NCAA. This is a shared responsibility. Presidents cannot effectively lead the Association or this division without your help.

Our second challenge is to resolve the future of Division III financial aid. Our financial aid principles are unique and they help to define us. They are not merely add-ons. They help to define us as a division. We are justifiably proud that we do not award athletic scholarships in Division III. Yet our current process is flawed at best. The approval process for awards of circumstance and nonathletic achievement awards is time-consuming, paper-intensive and really does not accomplish much from a compliance perspective. Far worse, however, is the pervasive atmosphere of suspicion, mistrust and innuendo that exists regarding the packaging and awarding of financial aid to our student-athletes. Whispering, finger-pointing and innuendo are rampant, fueled by the competitive nature of the recruitment and admissions process.

This afternoon, you will have an important opportunity to address this unfortunate situation through the adoption of Proposals 46, 46-1, and 46-2. The first two proposals retain the essence of the Division III prohibition against athletics aid. They eliminate the burdensome review processes related to awards of circumstance and nonathletic achievement awards. It is a process that has not worked.

The third proposal will place the division solidly on the path of adopting a financial aid compliance and enforcement process at next year's Convention. This legislation ultimately will help ensure that financial aid packages for student-athletes are comparable to those of students in general, will establish accountability toward that end and it will help to reestablish the integrity of our financial aid legislation. We will not be tinkering with the principles of awarding of financial aid in Division III. We will be looking at how to make our process work better to fulfill those principles. You will have a chance to hear more about this legislation and related compliance and enforcement concepts later this morning.

Our third challenge as we move ahead is to better balance the competing demands of academics and athletics. Our philosophy statement calls on us to "maintain an environment in which a stu-

dent-athletes's athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of a student-athlete's educational experience." How can we better do this?

One way is through the adoption of reasonable playing and practice limits during the nontraditional segment. The Division III philosophy statement emphasizes conflicting concepts in this regard — the priority of regular-season competition versus maximizing the competitive opportunities of our student-athletes. The reality is that time constraints, academic considerations, limited facilities and personnel all demand that we limit the current nontraditional segment.

We began this legislative effort during our last Convention. We should bring the effort to closure this afternoon. Proposal Nos. 48, 49 and 50 give us an opportunity to do that. Few delegates, perhaps no delegates, will regard any of those proposals as a perfect alternative. But that should not surprise us since the membership is very, very, very divided on this issue. Rather, we should review the proposals as good-faith attempts to achieve a consensus on a very controversial issue. In this regard, the Management and Presidents Councils believe that both Proposals 49 and 50 are the best alternative.

Another way to promote a better balance between academics and athletics is to more closely examine the role athletics plays on our campuses across the country. A good place to start is with Proposal No. 47, which eliminates the practice of redshirting. The idea that student-athletes would routinely extend their collegiate attendance to a fifth year in order to participate in an additional season of competition seems like a very foreign concept for our division. But the practice is alive and it is well and currently merits close scrutiny and more discussion.

Our fourth challenge relates to championships. We must retain regional in-season and conference play as the key basis for championship selection in team sports, consistent with our philosophy statement. We should ensure that selection criteria are well understood and applied in an objective and consistent manner across all sports. We also should ensure that access ratios are based upon uniform criteria applied consistently in all sports. We must fully explore the bidding, site selection and posting of championships in order to encourage more members to become involved in this valuable experience. Members of the Championships Committee will discuss all of these issues during their session later this afternoon. I urge you to listen carefully and to participate in that discussion.

Of course, the governance structure must also remain dedicated to addressing issues beyond championships. That is our fifth challenge. Our philosophy statement supports this concept, and our strategic plan demands it. Issues like student-athlete welfare, diversity and membership education and communication have received too little attention during our four years after restructuring. That is why the work of the Division III Initiatives Task Force is so important. I am proud of what that group has accomplished. As you will hear in a

few minutes, we are dedicating significant Division III resources toward initiatives beyond championships. The challenge now becomes bringing those programs to life, not only at the national office, but also at the conference and on campus level.

Our sixth challenge is to continue to deregulate the Division III Manual. We should retain only those legislative requirements necessary to promote and retain our philosophy and eliminate or amend those that do not. This effort must include the anachronistic amateurism standards currently applied to our student-athletes. Division II, in their business session today, will adopt major changes to their amateurism requirements. They are the first of the divisions to be out in front on this. I urge you to pay close attention to the amateurism and deregulation presentations you will hear later this morning and to listen with an open mind. The world has become much more complex since we first adopted those principles, so please listen to the discussion prior to making your final decision.

Finally, we must wisely manage the size and composition of our division. When our provisional members become our current members, we will expand our division to 430 institutions. We are the largest of all three NCAA divisions. This growth, much of it in a very short period of time, has created pushes and strains on our division. This is our final challenge. This need will become more evident when we increase our minimum sports sponsorship requirements on August 1. It will become critical when the current moratorium on new members expires in August 2002. We do not even know how many people are waiting outside the moratorium door to try to enter in quickly when that moratorium expires. But we know our division will grow again.

As you've heard, I believe many significant issues remain that demand our attention. I have identified seven challenges that our division will face during the next few years. You likely can think of more. Many of these issues are very complex and will require significant time, expertise and resources to resolve. I'm confident, however, that if these issues are addressed with the Division III philosophy statement in our mind, the governance structure and the membership can and will receive these issues for the greater good. Thank you. (Applause.)

We will now continue our business session by receiving reports from the Presidents Council and Management Council. Here to present the report of the Presidents Council is Tom Courtice, president of Ohio Wesleyan University. He has served the past two years with me on the Presidents Council as vice-chair and also has joined me as the second Division III representative on the NCAA Executive Committee, the Association-wide governance body. Tom will serve as chair of the Division III Presidents Council following the conclusion of this year's meeting. Tom.



**Tom Courtice** (Ohio Wesleyan University): Thank you, Ann. Thank you for your visionary words about Division III and our work. It's a real challenge to follow with the Presidents Council summaries of our work and then the Management Council. I feel as though I'm positioned a little like Zsa Zsa Gabor's seventh husband on their wedding night. I know exactly what I'm supposed to do, but I haven't figured out how to make this interesting for you. (Laughter.)

One of the distinguishing features in this third year of the NCAA federated structure is the presence of the Division III strategic plan. Ann's referred to it. It's providing a critical road map for our work, and the Management Council and various Division III committees have made excellent progress and advancement in the plan's goals and vision through their work. In that regard, the Presidents Council and the Management Council hold a joint meeting at each year's Convention. That meeting a year ago focused on the relationship of two key issues: the revenues provided by the new 11-year, \$6 billion CBS agreement and the financial impact that our share of those revenues can have on the priorities in the Division III strategic plan.

We determined a year ago that Division III should focus our use of these revenues on three of the plan's top priorities: student-athlete welfare, diversity and membership education and communication. The obvious task then was to identify some specific initiatives that would use our share of these revenues, roughly \$8½ million over the next three years to address these priorities. As a result, the Presidents Council did what presidents do best — we appointed a special committee to develop specific initiatives focusing on the priorities. The three-year plan developed by this special committee — the Division III Initiatives Task Force — will allocate the \$8.4 million in support of our three planning initiatives. That plan has since been endorsed by the Presidents Council.

Special thanks should go to the 14 members of the task force and in particular to John Biddiscombe, the director of athletics at Wesleyan University, who served so ably as task force chair. His leadership and the group's vision will direct significant new resources to all of us in the Division III membership. In a few minutes, John is going to present in greater detail about the development and implementation of these initiatives, including the process for accessing these resources. I hope, as do all of my colleagues on the Presidents Council, that you will use this opportunity as individual schools, as clusters of schools, as conferences, to draw on these resources and thereby enhance Division III programming.

The Presidents Council also tracked the Division III voice and Association-wide issues as that voice is expressed in the NCAA Executive Committee. As chair and vice-chair of Division III, Ann and I, as you have just been told, are the two voting members for Division III on the Executive Committee. We must continue to have a vigorous voice within that body, particularly as it relates to budget items and key Association-wide issues such as amateurism. These

can affect us all directly.

The Presidents Council also approved the work of the Convention Planning Committee. It's our hope that this new one-day business session format, along with the related Association-wide discussion sessions, will serve to encourage greater involvement of CEOs and result in a more efficient and valuable experience for all of the delegates.

Finally, there are five other significant issues on which the Presidents Council focused during the past year. We've already alluded to a couple of those. One, Division III financial aid. Again, Proposals Nos. 46 and 46-1, as sponsored by the Presidents Council, will simplify financial aid legislation and eliminate the current approval process for awards of circumstance and nonathletic achievement awards. These proposals will reaffirm the principle that athletics cannot be considered in the formulation of aid packages and that aid packages for student-athletes must be comparable to aid packages for students in general. Proposal No. 46-2 is cosponsored by the Presidents Council and calls for legislation at next year's Convention to establish a compliance and enforcement process to support the legislative changes contained in Proposal 46.

Secondly, championships. The establishment of additional Division III women's championships in rowing and ice hockey, as described in Proposals 55, 56 and 57 is indeed consistent with our efforts to provide equitable championship opportunities for student-athletes. Also, during this past year, we've established specific policies and procedures to reschedule Division III championships in the event a conflict exists between championship competition and institutional commencement exercises. This change allows for a more appropriate and more flexible resolution of conflict between commencements and championships, and it better protects the interests of our student-athletes. The Council also continues to monitor the implementation of the automatic qualification process. We will review in more detail the time line for addressing the issue this afternoon.

Three, nontraditional seasons. Clearly, the most contentious issue during last year's Convention was the nontraditional playing and practice segment. The Presidents Council supports Proposals 49 and 50, which would establish a five-week nontraditional segment and limit contests for selected team sports. We believe these proposals present a solid middle ground that a majority of the Division III membership can and should support. We look forward to membership dialogue and input on this issue later in the day.

Four, amateurism. The Division III philosophy regarding deregulation and student-athlete welfare are at the core of this issue. You will be given an opportunity to voice your opinions later this morning as the Amateurism Task Force provides an update of its work, including a possible legislative proposal for action at next year's Convention. Membership feedback on this issue is, as always, criti-

cal.

Five, gender equity and diversity. The Presidents Council reviewed the NCAA audit report as recommended by the Executive Committee's Subcommittee on Gender and Diversity Issues. We've reaffirmed the continued importance of presidential leadership on campus and it's relative to two key issues: the hiring of women and minorities and increasing participation opportunities in sports sponsorship for women and minorities.

Finally, the membership of the Presidents Council is fluid and will continue to change every year. We selected and welcomed Kevin Lagree, president of Simpson College in Iowa, to fill an immediate vacancy created by Roy Shilling's resignation. John McCardell, the president at Middlebury College, and John Roush, the president at Centre College, were elected to begin their service on the Council in about 24 hours at the close of this Convention. Jeanie Watson, the president of Nebraska Wesleyan, was reelected for a full four-year term on the Council. At the direction of the Council, I will serve as chair. Bette Landman, president of Beaver College, will serve as vice-chair of the Presidents Council next year.

Finally, two members' terms of service will conclude at the close of the Convention. I want to express publicly thanks to John DiBiaggio, president of Tufts University. Can you stand for just a minute, John? Thank you very much. (Applause.) And to Ann Die, president of Hendrix, who has served with distinction as chair for the past two years. We'll have more time near the end of this meeting, but it's important to say now as well that your time and your energy and your commitment to our division have been exemplary. Thank you for what we have all come to know as outstanding leadership.

That concludes my report. (Applause.)

**Ms. Die:** Thank you, Tom. It will be my goal in life to try to live up to those words you just said. I appreciate it.

I would like to ask all members of the Presidents Council, including those who have been individually identified thus far, to please stand and let the membership see who you are. (Applause.) Please remain standing because people are looking around.

When members of the Presidents Council and Management Council get materials for a meeting, it comes in wagon-load sizes. Walking around this Convention, I feel like a pack mule. I have one totally loaded bag on one shoulder and one totally loaded canvas bag on the other shoulder. It is my experience that when Management Council and Presidents Council members arrive at their meetings, they have digested all of that very complex information, read pros and cons compiled and written by many of you on the issues, and put in not hours, but days in meetings. As I said earlier, we began at 8 a.m. Friday morning and it has gone around the clock. I want to thank them publicly for the amount of time they put in and the seriousness they gave to their responsibilities.

To present the Management Council's report is Truman

Turnquist, professor of chemistry and faculty athletics representative at Mount Union College. Truman.

## MANAGEMENT COUNCIL REPORT

**Truman Turnquist** (Mount Union College): Thank you, President Die. On behalf of the Division III Management Council, I am pleased to provide a report of our work during the first year of this new millennium. It has been a year marked by significant discussion, dialogue and debate on a variety of issues that resulted in the legislative proposals that the membership will have an opportunity to vote on this afternoon and continue dialogue later today.

The Management Council would like to thank the members of the Division III committee structure for their work during the past year. The legislative requirements of Management Council representatives serving on all Division III and Association-wide committees continues to be very beneficial. It provides a critical communication link from committees to the Council. The Council would also like to express appreciation to members of the Division III Presidents Council for empowering and encouraging us to address issues in detail and present recommendations that reflect our collective wisdom.

I would like to offer special thanks to the members of the Convention Planning Committee. The efforts and work of this group are evident with the inclusion of several Association-wide professional development sessions that we have engaged in over the last two days as well as in our new one-day business session format. Our thanks to the members of this committee. That committee includes Tom Courtice, president, Ohio Wesleyan University, representing the Presidents Council; Brandon Graham, Hope College, representing the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee; Gary Karner, commissioner, Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, representing the National Association for Division III Athletic Administrators; Walter Johnson, director of athletics, North Central College, chair of the Division III Management Council; Donna Ledwin, commissioner of the New Jersey Athletic Conference, representing the Membership Committee; Bob Malekoff, director of athletics, College of Wooster; Oscar Page, president of Austin College, representing the Management Council; Joy Reighn, director of athletics, Rowan University, representing the Management Council and serving as chair; and finally, Christopher Walker, faculty athletics representative, representing the Management Council and FARA. This group, along with the Management and Presidents Council, will again be anxious to receive your feedback in our post-Convention questionnaire.

President Courtice just noted the significant work of the Division III Initiatives Task Force. I would only add that the Management Council is well represented on the task force and fully supports its recommendations.

General Management Council business during the year includes a significant amount of time reviewing the work and recommendations from Division III and Association-wide committees. We applaud the working relationship between the Management Council and the committee structure. In response to your input from last year's Convention, you will not receive written or oral reports during today's business session. Rather, the work of all division Association-wide committees will be summarized in the Division III newsletter and will be available on the NCAA Web site.

We spent considerable time on issues related to membership, financial aid, deregulation, amateurism and championships. Much of the work of these committees is reflected in the 32 legislative proposals and related amendments we will consider this afternoon, including six submitted by the Division III membership. Federation has indeed proven to be a positive aspect of restructuring the NCAA for Division III because it has allowed us to consider legislation that directly addresses issues unique to our division.

The Council also addressed a few key Association-wide issues. As a result of the charge by the Executive Committee, the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports developed a document to assist member institutions in evaluating their athletics health care coverage and educational reform effective in 2004. That document was mailed to the membership in November. The Council provided input into the development of that document and approved a discussion session.

We also approved the recommendation to establish a two-year membership moratorium through September 1, 2002. The Membership Committee is in the process of developing long-term Division III membership. You will hear more about this effort during the upcoming year.

As a result of the referral of 2000 Convention Proposal No. 55 on nontraditional segments, the Council and its playing and practice season subcommittee spent considerable time discussing and debating the issue and soliciting input from the membership. Proposal Nos. 48, 49 and 50 are the result of the discussion. The Council thanks the New Jersey Athletic and Great Northeast Conferences for their initiative in submitting proposals on this very important membership issue. As President Courtice noted, the Council supports Proposal Nos. 49 and 50.

Financial aid compliance and deregulation was another significant topic of discussion. Proposal Nos. 46, 46-1 and 46-2 are the result of much work by the Financial Aid Committee and member conferences to identify recommendations to change how the division monitors compliance and enforcement of our financial aid legislation. You will hear the details of the proposals later this morning in preparation for this afternoon's voting.

In the area of championships, we approved increased access in funding for student-athletes in individual and team sports. The adop-

tion of Proposal Nos. 55, 56 and 57 to add Division III women's championships in ice hockey and rowing will help provide more equitable championship opportunities within Division III. This afternoon you will hear from Championships Committee members regarding the status of the championships experience, including the automatic qualification process and issues related to championship site selection and posting. The committee will address these two critical issues during the upcoming years, so your input is very important.

In regard to deregulation efforts in our division, as President Courtice noted, amateurism likely is an issue to be addressed by the membership at the 2002 Convention. Manual deregulation continues to be a goal for the Interpretations and Legislation Committee. The committee will present more specific information regarding its work later this morning.

For the first time this spring, Division III will be involved in the NCAA-sponsored regional rules seminars. Membership, Financial Aid, and Interpretations and Legislation Committees jointly are working on Division III content to be presented during the one-day sessions. We encourage you to consider attending one of the three educational development seminars. Information will be mailed to all members in February.

We also welcome Connee Zotos, director of athletics, Drew University, to the Council. In conclusion, the Management Council wishes to thank five individuals whose terms of service will conclude at the close of Convention: Al Bean, director of athletics at the University of Southern Maine; Amy Huchthausen, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse, is concluding her term as a representative of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee; Louise O'Neal, director of athletics, Wellesley College; Kathryn Springsteen as she leaves her position as faculty athletics representative at Colby-Sawyer College and the Council to assume the duties of dean of faculty at Wilmington College; Walter Johnson, director of athletics, North Central College, who, the past year, has chaired the Council. His time, commitment and dedication to our division have been outstanding. Walter, we know that you've made many personal and professional sacrifices over the past year in support of the division. You left your mark of leadership on the division and the members of the Council and for that we are grateful.

Each of these individuals has served the division in the highest professional manner. Finally, the Council elected Joy Reighn, director of athletics, Rowan University, to serve as chair; and Oscar Page, president, Austin College, as vice-president for the upcoming year.

As you can tell, the Management Council and all Division III committees have had another busy year working on the goals and priorities for Division III. We are happy with our progress but, as always, challenged by what lies ahead. I would be happy to entertain any questions you may have at this time, although in this format I understand that's somewhat awkward.

Before I conclude my report, I would like to make a personal comment. It's been a real privilege to serve as a member of Management Council during the last four years. I know that there are many in the audience today who have the experience and the insight into athletic matters that could benefit the NCAA immensely, and I would encourage you to consider volunteering for a term on the Management Council. It's been a great experience. (Applause.)

**Ms. Die:** Thank you, Truman. Please join me in expressing to Truman our gratitude, which we began to do with our applause, but also include the departing Management Council and the entire Management Council members for their dedication and commitment to Division III over the past years. I would like to ask all members of Management Council to stand. (Applause.) No one appreciates your work as much as those on the Presidents Council, who get to see your reports and know the amount of time and commitment you put in. My sincere thanks.

There are two other groups of individuals I would like to acknowledge. One group consists of all those who have served in the NCAA governance structure. If you have served on an NCAA committee in the past year, any NCAA committee, please stand. It is only through your hard work and the work of other NCAA committee members that the business of the NCAA is accomplished. Thank you for your work. (Applause.)

You heard from Truman saying he knows there are many of you out there who could have significant input and offer a great deal to the Association. So I would like to note that the Nominating Committee has set a table up in the area outside of our meeting room. There you can obtain more information regarding committee vacancies and the committee nomination and selection process. I encourage you to stop by that table, especially if you're not currently involved in the committee structure.

The second group I would like to acknowledge are those who hosted NCAA championship competition during the past year. Championships do not take place without a great deal of hard work by many individuals at the host school. This hard work results in quality championships experiences for all of our student-athletes. If your school or conference office has hosted any round of an NCAA championship during the past year, please stand and be recognized. All members from that institution, even if there are student-athletes here as well. (Applause.) Thank you. We would like to have more of our Division III membership schools participate in hosting championships. We would be very pleased to talk with you about that.

We're now ready to begin our morning discussion sessions. I would like to note a couple of significant changes in that regard. First, we made a conscious effort this year not to distribute handouts related to each discussion session. Instead, each session will be presented in a Powerpoint format. The agenda and Powerpoint presentation for each discussion session are available on the NCAA Web

site, ncaa.org. We made this change based from feedback from our Management Council and the Convention Planning Committee.

Another change is that we will not distribute written reports from each Division III and Association-wide committee, nor will we hear from each committee chair. It simply is not possible to do this and accomplish all of the other business we have to accomplish during one day. Again, the feedback our Convention Planning Committee received from you suggested our time would be better spent in other ways.

We also concluded that the quarterly Division III newsletter provides ample opportunity for the membership to follow the important work of each committee. I also want to note that articles on important committee initiatives appear regularly in *The NCAA News* and that the NCAA Web site soon will include agenda supplements, minutes and rosters for all committees.

Our next discussion is very significant. It relates to the work of the Division III Initiatives Task Force. Our task force was just a gleam in our collective eye at this time last year. It has accomplished a great deal during the last 12 months and has laid the groundwork for program initiatives that will improve our division at the institutional, conference and national levels. Guiding the process throughout as the task force chair has been John Biddiscombe, director of athletics at Wesleyan University and former immediate past chair of the Management Council. I believe our division owes a great deal to John and the other members of the task force for their hard work on this project. John will present the task force report.

## **INITIATIVES TASK FORCE REPORT**

**John Biddiscombe** (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): Thank you, President Die, for those kind remarks and recognizing the work of the task force.

I'm extremely pleased to speak today on behalf of the Division III Initiatives Task Force. First, let me say it's a pleasure to come to the microphone not having to conduct straw votes, make interpretations, rule delegates out of order or to try to explain to you why the voting machines don't work. In fact, Walter Johnson, who I was speaking with this morning, has told me that the state of Florida has provided us with an amount of chadless paper ballots in the event that this afternoon the voting machines do not work.

Secondly, I have the opportunity to speak with you about many new initiatives that will become available to the membership over the next three years. I believe that you will find these initiatives provide a new direction for Division III. The \$8.4 million that is budgeted to support the initiative is intended to provide creative new programming on campuses and enhance the opportunities and staffing, as well as provide two new national championships for women's sports.

The Division III strategic plan has been the foundation for all



planning in the division. The focus has been on diversity, membership education and student-athlete welfare. In post-Convention meetings, the Division III Presidents Council last year recommended the formation of a special committee to develop specific initiatives related to the strategic planning priorities and the budget impact of developing these initiatives. The funds to support the new programs are made available to the division as a result of the Association's new contract with CBS.

Before I go on to the next slide, I want to add that a summary of the Powerpoint presentation, as indicated to you before, now appears on the NCAA Web page and can be accessed by contacting [ncaa.org](http://ncaa.org) and then selecting Division III Convention Information. That will provide you access to what you'll hear in this report.

The Division III Initiatives Task Force is a special committee formed to develop proposals that respond to the Presidents Council's charge and to address the top three strategic planning priorities and develop a time line for implementation that corresponds with the rights fees resources. In October, the Presidents Council endorsed the task force plan.

The task force is comprised of 14 volunteers and was staffed by two members of the Division III governance staff — Dan Dutcher, chief of staff, and Bridget Belgiovine, assistant chief of staff. The task force consisted of five college presidents, four athletic directors, two faculty representatives, a conference commissioner and two members of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. I personally want to thank those members of the committee. I can promise you that the discussions surrounding these initiatives were very thoughtful and productive and some of the best of any committee that I have served on. This group met six times either in person or by teleconference and communicated regularly with the membership.

The task force proposals are organized over three years, beginning with academic year 2000-01. Also, all of the initiatives were developed using the following criteria: They reflect the Division III strategic plan; they had direct impact on Division III student-athletes, coaches, administrators and campus leadership; they are quantifiable and measurable; they are sustainable over time; they are relatively easy to administer.

The \$8.4 million-based budget for the proposal, as identified in this slide, utilizes funds from the new CBS rights fees beginning in 2002 and from the existing Division III reserve. Also, many of the initiatives partner with existing programs sponsored by the National Association of Collegiate Women Administrators and the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics and are accessible to all member institutions and conferences.

Finally, the task force has developed a time line to periodically evaluate the success of the initiatives and, when necessary, make recommendations for modifications or the replacement of the initiatives. Each slide describes a summary of the initiative, the allocation of the

resources, and the application process.

Let's look at the specific initiatives as they are organized by planning priority. The first priority would be that of diversity. The approach to addressing diversity will supplement the existing programs and add many new ones. As you know, the NCAA currently sponsors 12 postgraduate scholarships for ethnic minorities and 12 for females. This initiative will add three postgraduate scholarships designated for Division III candidates only. The \$6,000 scholarships are available to graduating seniors, and the application deadline is February 16, 2001.

I am sure that many of the delegates in this room are alumnae of the NACWAA institute that is held at Bryn Mawr College each summer. This initiative will provide 12 additional tuition scholarships annually for current or aspiring Division III female administrators. Funding for this initiative will be available this spring. The \$2,000 scholarships are available on a first-come basis with an application deadline of March 10. The scholarship program is administered by the NACWAA. Special consideration will be given to those individuals who are unable to acquire financial support from their college or university.

A very similar initiative to the prior one is the initiative that will provide 24 annual grants to be used by minority males to participate in the NACDA Management Institute held each June at the site of the NACDA annual convention. Each of them, not to exceed \$1,000 grants, can be used to offset registration fees, three nights of lodging and partial transportation. Again, the grants are available on a first-come basis. For further information, interested individuals should contact Becky Parks at the NACDA office.

A significant goal of the Division III strategic plan is to increase the number of women and ethnic minorities in leadership positions in college athletics. To provide these groups with athletic administrative and coaching opportunities, the task force created 30 \$12,000 grants to be used to support internships. I am sure that many of you will support my enthusiasm for this initiative. It not only provides significant opportunities for women and minorities, it enables 25 member institutions to secure much-needed additional administrative or coaching personnel. This grant program also provides that five of the 30 internships be reserved for conference administration.

The application and distribution deadlines for the internships have yet to be completely worked out; however, the process will begin in January of 2002. Ten thousand dollars have been designated for a consultant to develop the program in detail during the next 12 months, and interns will be able to begin their two-year appointments in the fall of 2002.

The budgets for all the initiatives contain funds for administrative support. In some instances, additional NCAA personnel are warranted and will be provided.

Another program that has similar goals and objectives as a

Division III internship initiative is the NCAA Fellows Program. This existing program provides professional development for individuals who are interested in becoming Division III senior level administrators. Beginning in 2002, two additional fellowships restricted for Division III personnel will become available. I want to note here that the NCAA fellows have full-time jobs at NCAA institutions or conferences. The \$25,000 grant is a supplement to their campus salary to be used for travel and educational materials. I also want to indicate at this time that the Division III Presidents Council and Management Council will monitor the process by which fellows are chosen and be certain that funds currently existing for Division III fellows will not be eroded. The application process for the fellowship grants will not begin until the fall of 2002. The grants will begin in January 2003.

One of the most significant and exciting grant programs designed to increase staffing diversity at Division III institutions and conference offices is the Strategic Alliance Matching Grant. The annual budget for this blockbuster grant program is \$750,000. The grant is designed to provide salary funding for a minority or female administrator who also may have some coaching responsibility. The grant is available on a multiyear basis. The institution or conference must provide 25 percent of the salary during the first year of the grant, 50 percent of the salary during the second year and 75 percent of the salary in the third year. This program becomes available during the second semester of the 2001-02 academic year. I urge you to go back to your campus and speak with your administration about this fantastic opportunity and begin to make plans to apply for funding in future years.

We now move on to those initiatives dealing with student-athlete welfare. The first slide lists the initiatives in this category. The first of these initiatives is the conference grant proposal to support the further development of the conference Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. This initiative makes \$60,000 available annually for the support of student representatives in conference affairs. The funds can be used to offset communication costs, to support speakers, fund the remaining travel costs for students at conference SAAC meetings or other similar proposals that might come forward from conference offices. The NCAA governance and finance staffs will administer this program. The moneys will be distributed to the conference offices in September of 2001. Conference administrators should soon begin discussing with member institutions how they will use this funding to enhance their Student-Athlete Advisory Committees.

Over the past 24 months, one of the topics most discussed at the Presidents Council meetings and on college campuses is binge drinking. Despite all of the discussions and the use of various educational programming, risky behavior by some students is prevalent. However, a new and effective way to address this problem is the use of social norming. To support expansion of the social norming pro-

gram, Division III is making available 12 institutional \$8,000 grants to institute STARR programs on Division III campuses. These 12 programs will successfully pave the way for more funding to become available in future years to help reduce the dangerous drinking taking place on college campuses. A full-time administrator will be hired to coordinate this program, and funding for the first year will be available in the 2001-02 academic year.

A goal of the strategic plan is to provide leadership opportunities for our student-athletes as well. Division I has been very active in providing leadership programming through the CHAMPS/Life Skills Program and the spring leadership conference that takes place here in Orlando. However, the Initiatives Task Force believes that it's important to provide this type of training for Division III athletes as well. Therefore, funding has been designated to provide two annual spring leadership conferences held at regional sites. The details for the selection process and goals for the program are contained on this slide.

The last slide provides the funding sources for the conferences. I am sure you will agree that this will be an exciting and valuable opportunity for our students beginning in the academic year 2002-03. Many of you probably have been wondering when I was going to mention new initiatives that provide championship enhancements. In fact, championship enhancements as a group represent the largest amount of funding. The next slide introduces the enhancements that include travel party increases in seven team sports, an increase in officials' fees in softball and men's and women's diving, as well as participant increases in men's and women's outdoor track and field, and championship per diem increases in all sports. The per diem has been increased to \$65 per day, per person. Also, the championships initiatives include the establishment of two new national championships in women's rowing and ice hockey. As in the past, all championships initiatives will be administered by the Division III Championships Committee.

The last set of planning priorities are in the area of membership education. Before you is a list of those initiatives. As technology becomes more of a part of our daily work on campuses and we become more dependent on the use of technology to receive NCAA services, it seemed essential that some of the new funding be used to enhance the NCAA's ability to deliver these services. This technology will support Division III communication in the operation and maintenance of the NCAA Web site. The \$85,000 annually budgeted for this purpose has already created some significant improvements to the NCAA Web site and will continue to do so in the future.

With continued enhancements to the NCAA Division III Web page and the use of technology to communicate policies and procedural information, it is essential for conference offices to have the necessary hardware and software to access the information distributed by the NCAA. From a substantial budget of \$350,000, each con-

ference will receive a not-to-exceed \$10,000 grant to enhance its technology. The end result will hopefully provide the NCAA a vehicle to provide improved services to the membership. Conference administrators need to apply for funds during June of 2001, and fund distribution will occur in September. I'm sure this support will be well used by the 35 Division III conferences.

The task force was interested in providing an opportunity for conference member schools and independent institutions to have access to new educational programming and to have dialogue with the NCAA staff. It was decided to add a Division III specific component to the existing NCAA regional seminars. The money allocated in this area will be used to prepare materials and programming for a one-day seminar at the regional site. Member institutions will be responsible for their own travel and expenses. This slide lists the sites for the upcoming spring seminars.

To further enhance educational opportunities for independent institutions, the task force has provided grants to support their attendance at the annual regional seminars. This initiative provides a \$500 maximum grant for personnel from independent institutions to attend one of the two annual regional seminars. The funds can be used for travel and lodging and would be available this spring. A letter explaining the procedure for acquiring funding will be mailed to independent institutions this month. Grant recipients will be notified in early April. The annual budget for this support is \$30,000.

One of the most effective methods to educate the membership is to keep the conference administrators well informed. This next initiative provides \$35,000 in support of an annual meeting of conference commissioners with NCAA leadership and staff. Each conference will be eligible to receive a not-to-exceed \$1,000 grant to attend this essential meeting. The first annual meeting will be held in Indianapolis June 21 and 22 of 2001.

The involvement of faculty athletic representatives at the NCAA Convention has been limited. Therefore, the task force has placed in the budget a sum of \$50,000 to be used annually by faculty reps as educational and development grants. The task force also believes that this grant program will provide greater involvement by Division III faculty reps in FARA and in turn will strengthen the overall faculty representatives association. FARA and the NCAA governance staff will administer the funds. Also, FARA will assist in developing criteria for fund acquisition. Current plans are to begin to make the funds available during the 2001 fall semester.

This afternoon, the membership will have an opportunity to discuss and vote on Proposal No. 46 and Resolution 46-2. This very important financial legislation, if supported by the membership, will change the manner in which Division III complies with and enforces financial aid rules. The next initiative provides funds to educate the membership about financial aid legislation and establishes an enforcement process. Much of this process will include a significant

involvement of conferences. The task force has set aside \$50,000 to assist in financial aid education and enforcement.

Throughout our discussions, the task force continued to find ways in which we can direct funding back to campuses and to allow member institutions to develop creative proposals to use the new moneys to address critical campus issues. The final grant initiative that is before you today accomplishes that objective. The initiative is divided into three categories for organizational purposes. They are educational programs and workshops, educational and professional development, and student-athlete and diversity issues. Also, I want to add that the task force encourages the membership to develop proposals with this funding with entrepreneurial spirit and strongly consider collaborating with other institutions or conferences to gain larger grants to support new programming.

The professional development grants, as you can see by the next slide, provides \$5,000 grants for the issues you are facing on a daily basis. If you possibly would like to develop a program where a nutritionist is available to meet with your athletes on a weekly basis, this grant may help you begin such a valuable program. Additional moneys have also been made available to campus leaders, such as athletic directors, coaches and faculty reps, to attend seminars that focus on critical educational issues. Another way to use these funds, not to exceed \$5,000 grants, would be for a conference to sponsor a speaker to visit all the member schools in the conference.

The grants in this initiative dealing with student-athlete welfare and diversity are open-ended and could provide substantial funding to member schools or conferences. The leadership grants are administered by the NCAA professional development and educational outreach staff. The substantial funding available for these grants will be very popular. I encourage those institutions that are interested in obtaining funds to note that the requests for proposals will be distributed in March and due back in the NCAA office in June. Initial funding for this series of grants is \$450,000; however, by 2002-03, a total of \$750,000 will be available annually for the members to develop creative educational programming.

The next three slides summarize the initiative by area of emphasis. Also, I want to again emphasize that each grant program will include an evaluation requirement. In addition, the task force will meet each of the next two years to review the overall process and to evaluate the success of the various initiatives. The task force will be prepared to fine-tune, modify, eliminate or add new grant programs after receiving your feedback.

Under diversity, we have both scholarship enhancement grants and internship opportunities. The largest amount of funding in this group is the \$1.3 million in the matching grant program. As seen in the next slide, student-athlete welfare initiatives include championship initiatives, programs and workshops for student-athletes, and 24 grants for the innovative STARR program. Also, please note that

1,800 Division III athletes over the next three years will be impacted by the conference SAAC funding. Finally, in this area, \$100,000 is allocated for student-athlete programming on campus, and one-half million dollars is allocated for two regional leadership conferences.

The last group of initiatives is for membership education, utilizing NCAA Web site enhancement, conference technology grants, Division III involvement at regional seminars and an annual meeting with the independent institutions, as well as a meeting with conference administrators. All of these Division III initiatives will improve Division III communication and education. Additional grants will be provided for campus initiatives, faculty rep professional development and support of financial aid education and enforcement.

Let's look now at a summary of an allocation of all the resources: \$2,602,000 to diversity; over \$2 million for membership education and communication; close to \$3 million for student-athlete welfare; and \$800,000 for staffing to develop and administer all the initiatives. Finally, a three-year grand total: \$8,479,000.

I now welcome your questions or comments from the delegation. Also, I encourage members of the task force to feel free to clarify or make comments and add to the discussion. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

**Dennis Collins** (North Coast Athletic Conference): John, I want to salute you and the task force for an outstanding job of making sure everybody in our organization has been included in this fantastic outlay. I go back far enough, and I know some of us in the room go back far enough, to the mid-70s when our national championships were decided only if Division I had enough money left over from its funding so we could have a championship in a couple of sports. We have come a long way, I'll tell you. We also, I guess, have to thank our friends in Division I for the surplus. But I do want to salute you and the task force for being so inclusive and including everybody in this. Thank you.

**Mr. Biddiscombe:** Thank you, Dennis. On behalf of the committee, I appreciate your comments. (Applause.) Are there other questions or comments? Seeing none, I want to again thank you for your patient attendance. Thank you. (Applause.)

**Ms. Die:** Thank you, John. I think that many of you can see exactly what we were talking about when we said how hard this particular Initiatives Task Force had worked and how many hours they put in. We would also like feedback from you about the Powerpoint presentation — how you felt about that rather than having the paper in your hand. Please give that to us at the close of the meeting.

The opportunity to allocate Division III dollars to address issues like student-athlete welfare, diversity and membership education at the Division III level is very significant. I believe the work of this task force will be one of the lasting legacies in the evolution of the new governance structure. You should all be proud of what has been

accomplished so far and excited by what lies ahead. I urge each of you to monitor the development of these programs and attempt to access them as much as possible for your individual students, for your coaches, for your conference offices, for your campuses. There are funds out there to promote Division III philosophies. So watch the Division III newsletter as it comes to you so that you can see deadlines for applications for these new programs.

We have a new group getting assembled on the dais. Our next discussion will update you on the work of the Division III Amateurism Task Force. That group also was just getting off the ground at this time last year. Amateurism is a very dynamic issue in the Association right now. You heard Ced address it yesterday in his state of the Association address. In fact, as I said to you earlier, our colleagues in Division II will consider legislation — very significant legislation changes — to that division's amateurism rules later today. The Division I governance structure likely will vote on similar changes in April.

Here to present the report are Tom Weingartner, director of athletics at the University of Chicago and task force chair, and other members of the task force who will be introduced later. Tom.

## **AMATEURISM TASK FORCE REPORT**

**Tom Weingartner** (University of Chicago): Thank you very much. We're going to present a Powerpoint presentation. We're going to start out with Steve Erber, who will introduce you to the issues concerning amateurism and then proceed through the presentation. Steve.

**Steve Erber** (Muhlenberg University): Good morning. I'm the director of athletics at Muhlenberg College, a member of the Division III Amateurism Task Force and a professional golfer. (Laughter.) I'll tell you a little bit more about that later.

My job this morning is to review some of the work of the task force committee, let you know what has brought us to this point and hopefully stimulate discussion about this very important topic.

First, let me introduce the task force. Joining me on the dais are Tom Weingartner, chair of the task force and director of athletics at the University of Chicago; and Joann Andregg, associate athletics director at the University of St. Thomas in Minnesota and the immediate past chair of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee. I would also like to recognize the work of NCAA staff liaisons Julie Roe, Jennifer Strawley and Lisa Dehon, who have provided considerable organization and guidance for our task force group.

The next slide lists the five areas we will review this morning and upon which we hope to provide you with some background. These five areas are: the amateurism principle, a set of core values, problems specific to Division III, Division III precedents, and a time line for the remainder of our work.

The principle of amateurism is contained in Bylaw 2.9 of the



NCAA Manual. As was reported yesterday by Cedric Dempsey in his state of the Association address, this principle has not been reviewed in quite a number of years. As our discussion proceeds, there are a couple of comments that I think are important to keep in mind. First of all, the task force is looking at amateurism issues as they pertain to pre-enrolled student-athletes, just pre-enrolled student-athletes.

We have done nothing with looking at currently enrolled student-athletes. Two, the task force strongly embraces the principle of amateurism, but we feel its current application is inappropriate to impose on prospective student-athletes or it is being applied inconsistently. Again, if you recall yesterday's remarks by Mr. Dempsey, he stated that we have in place a set of amateurism principles, but we waive them on a regular basis. The work of the task force indicates that he's exactly on target.

Three, and I think this is really important, the subject of amateurism brings forth for many of us, myself included, long-held beliefs, philosophies that we feel strongly about and principles that we hold dearly. Quite frankly, this topic is not the same, at least for me it's not, as deciding whether or not we begin basketball practice on October 15.

Let me go back to the work of the task force. We've been in existence approximately a year and a half. We've taken a two-prong analysis to this issue. Those two prongs are determining our philosophy specific to amateurism and assessing the impact of possible changes being considered by Divisions I and II. Our focus has clearly been what makes sense for Division III. The impact of Division I and II changes has been secondary in our thinking, but we recognize that what the other divisions decide may in fact impact Division III as well.

We developed a set of core values to guide our deliberations. Those include clarity, common sense, consistency, student-athlete welfare, competitive fairness and support for the Division III philosophy. The task force has met two times in telephone conference and two times in person. We presented a panel at the NCAA 2000 Convention and again at the NACDA convention this past June. We surveyed a sampling of the Division III membership. Tom Weingartner, our chair, has written an editorial that appeared in *The NCAA News*.

Additionally, we have dealt specifically with the following issues. Issue No. 1: The current rules attempt to control activities of prospects and organizations over whom we have little or no control. The assumption that these people have knowledge of NCAA rules is unrealistic. As I stated earlier, our efforts have been directed at amateurism concerns as they pertain to prospective student-athletes only.

Issue No. 2: The current rules lack clarity, consistency and common sense. For example, the distinction between professional and amateur is really a very fuzzy one. There are leagues that are titled

“professional” in which the players are not paid. Conversely, there are leagues that are titled “amateur” to which the players do get paid.

Additionally, the current definition of professional athletics team in the NCAA Manual uses the word professional seven times to define a professional. I had trouble understanding that at first, but my colleagues explained it to me. It’s like if somebody asks you, “What’s a cow?” you say, well, “a cow is a cow.” In the Manual, the definition of a professional uses the word professional to explain.

One of the best examples of how little common sense some of the current rules make is as follows. This is an actual example. A 15-year-old high-school sophomore gets a hole in one at his golf club in his local community. As a result, he wins a new pickup truck. Apparently, I guess anyone who gets a hole in one on that golf course gets a pickup truck. Somebody, and I believe it was his mother, had the presence to inquire how this would affect his future college eligibility. They were informed that acceptance of the truck would render this young man forever ineligible for intercollegiate athletics.

Issue No. 3: The most severe sanctions are applied to those who, quote, “intend to professionalize.” They are generally ruled permanently ineligible. And one of the things that the committee on reinstatement has really struggled with is how does one actually assess intent? For example, a 17-year-old young man signs a baseball contract and goes through a tryout. He never competes, he never gets paid, and he is forever ineligible for NCAA competition.

Issue No. 4: We have a mandate from the Division III strategic plan to deregulate and focus our attention on student-athlete welfare. Many of the current amateurism rules do neither of these two things.

Finally, let me discuss briefly how we have arrived at the point we now find ourselves. First, as mentioned earlier, the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee has experienced more and more difficulty and struggles frequently. They struggle technically and ethically and even perhaps morally in ruling in many of these reinstatement cases. As an example, I refer you back to the 17-year-old who signed the contract with a professional team tries out with that team, and fails professionally. That’s where we’ve come up with the term fails professionally. Consequently, that 17-year-old becomes forever ineligible. I think you can see why that might present an ethical dilemma for someone having to make that kind of ruling.

Second, we have arrived at this point because of the mandate in our strategic plan to focus on student-athlete welfare and deregulate our Manual and our organization. Finally, we have arrived at this point because of the possible impact of changes being considered by Divisions I and II. We’ve heard a number of times in the last two days that Division II is probably at this time voting on legislation, so those changes have to be considered. I want to again emphasize this was the least important factor in our deliberations, but nonetheless it must be considered. Even with your new federated governance, we

cannot operate totally alone.

I mentioned before that I was a professional golfer. Many of you have played golf with me. You know nothing could be further from the truth. But we have an alumni golf event every year. A year ago, I won the closest to the pin. So I won a putter. I accepted the putter. I have no intention of giving the putter back. I guess that makes me a professional golfer.

At this time, I'd like to have Tom Weingartner discuss specific situations and the resulting precedents that have been established.

**Mr. Weingartner:** Thank you, Steve. We'd like to give you some real case precedents from Division III that address contracts, entering the draft, the seasons-of-competition rule, competition with professionals, acceptance of prize money and acceptance of pay for play so we can sink our teeth into these issues and you can get a sense of their scope.

The first example is signing a contract. I hope my colleagues in the cheap seats can read the Powerpoint. I'll highlight it. A prospective student-athlete signs a baseball contract and never receives any signing bonus. He is forever ineligible to compete at the NCAA Division III level by virtue of his intent to professionalize by signing a contract.

The second example is a soccer prospective student-athlete also signs a contract. The prospect did not receive any compensation and played in only three exhibition games. The eligibility action — not reinstated, forever ineligible to compete at the Division III level.

We've struggled with these cases, this one in particular. The sense has been and the feedback we've received from the membership is that this is an overly harsh sanction. The task force consensus is to allow prospective student-athletes to sign a contract and enter the draft. This is a case of what we have come to call the "failed professional." The rationale: There is no significant competitive advantage gained in doing either of these.

Let me go to our seasons-of-competition rule. This is really the cornerstone around which all our other recommendations are based because it addresses one of the main concerns of the membership — competitive advantage. I'll read along with you and then I'll give you an example in a moment.

Subsequent to high-school graduation, if a prospect does not enroll at a collegiate institution upon his or her first opportunity, the prospect shall be charged with a season of intercollegiate competition for every calendar year subsequent to high-school graduation and prior to full-time collegiate enrollment during which the prospect engages in organized competition. We'll define organized competition in a moment. If the prospect engages in organized competition, upon matriculation, the prospect must fulfill an academic year in residence.

Here's another example. A prospective student-athlete graduates from high school in the spring of 2000, competes for two years on the

tennis circuit or in a semiprofessional soccer league prior to enrolling in college, then enrolls in college in the fall of 2002. That student-athlete would be charged with two seasons of competition and be required to sit an academic year in residence before competing. In other words, that student has only two years of eligibility left after sitting a year in residence.

As for definitions of organized competition, we did not want to include — and this is for the purposes only of the consideration of amateurism — participation in church leagues, pickup basketball, Y leagues or summer softball. So the definition of organized competition is as follows: Any team competition or training in which compensation is provided; any individual competition or training in which the participant receives compensation; any competition pursuant to the signing of a contract; any competition pursuant to the involvement of a professional draft funded by a professional sports organization; any competition funded by a representative of an institution's athletics interest and is not an open event; and any practice with professional athletics team, excluding the 48-hour tryout. That is the definition of organized competition that we've been dealing with.

As for competition with professionals, we have another example of a real Division III case precedent. A prospective student-athlete competes in 16 contests and does not sign a contract, but receives \$300 in actual and necessary expenses. The action taken in this case — eligibility was reinstated after the athlete was withheld from the first 25 percent of his competitive schedule. In this instance, eligibility was reinstated. Keep in mind that in the instance of an athlete who signs a professional contract and receives no competitive advantage, that athlete, by virtue of signing the contract, is forever ineligible. We have been uncomfortable with this perceived inequity. The task force recommendation is to allow the prospective student-athletes to compete with professionals. We believe the adoption of the seasons-of-competition rule fairly addresses the issue of competitive advantage.

The next example we need to consider is the acceptance of prize money. If a prospective student-athlete receives \$50 based on his place finish in a road race, eligibility is reinstated after the student-athlete repays the value of that prize. Again, eligibility is reinstated in this instance upon repayment.

Here's the next example of prize money. In a women's skiing event, \$500 based on place finish was received by a prospective student-athlete. Again, the eligibility was reinstated after repayment. She was not forever ineligible because there was no signing of a contract. She was eligible after repayment. The task force consensus and our recommendation on this issue is to allow prospective student-athletes to accept prize money. We felt money would not yield a competitive advantage in this situation.

Finally, we have perhaps our most controversial recommendation

and one that we struggled with in terms of pay for play. A prospective student-athlete signed a contract, played softball professionally for 20 days and received a salary of \$4,100. Eligibility was not reinstated. Our recommendations of the Division I sub-task force on amateurism was to allow student-athletes to play for pay. There is no competitive advantage. What we're concerned about is the issue of competitive advantage in the organized competition role. I do believe that this would be appropriate for prospective student-athletes. I need to emphasize that. I want to emphasize that again that we're not talking about student-athletes currently enrolled in our programs. We're talking about prospective student-athletes in this country and all over the world.

Let me now introduce Joann Andregg, who will conclude our presentation. Joann, the recently retired chair of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee, dealt with these issues over the past several years.

**Joann Andregg** (University of St. Thomas, Minnesota): My task today is first of all to summarize what Steve and Tom have presented for you based on the work of the Division III Amateurism Task Force and to also give you some time in that summary to think about issues that you can support in which Tom brought up earlier.

First of all, in summary, remember that the reason for our committee is really grounded in the Division III strategic plan. Two areas — deregulation and student-athlete welfare — have brought about the need for reform in our amateurism rules. Second of all, Mr. Dempsey has made amateurism deregulation one of his primary initiatives for the NCAA. Mr. Dempsey has said that a common-sense approach to amateurism without compromising our commitment to education is the best path to take.

As the previous speakers have said, we are not interested in getting rid of our principles of amateurism. They simply need to be changed to reflect the current world in which we live. Right now as we speak, both Division I and II are voting on amateur deregulation. It is our job now to think about what is best for Division III. How did we get here and why does amateurism need to be fixed?

The first indication that our current rules do not work was apparent in the work of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee. Schools were increasingly seeking the reinstatement of prospective student-athletes who had violated one of our amateurism rules, but whom they believed should be eligible. In processing these cases, it became apparent that our rules were overly punitive in some areas. As the committee explored why our rules were inconsistent and inadequate, it was determined that we were in need of rules that bring clarity and fairness to the process.

While it may seem odd and almost blasphemous to talk about changing the amateurism rules for pre-enrolled students — which we all know is the cornerstone for this organization — I now can assure you that after a comprehensive study of our amateurism rules and

how they actually affect the lives of our prospective student-athletes, we have decided that these rules do need changing.

As a member of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee, I have seen cases in which a prospective student-athlete has signed a contract without the help of an agent in order to participate in a professional tryout for hockey, baseball or soccer. In most of these situations, the athlete did not have the ability to be termed a professional. No money changed hands, no expenses were paid. In some instances, the student was actually sent home before the tryout was even finished. The mere act of signing that contract meant that that particular student lost all eligibility in that sport for life.

In many cases, it precludes that prospective student-athlete from even thinking about attending one of our fine institutions. If you think it doesn't have an impact on their lives, it truly does.

The bottom line is that our current amateurism rules are penalizing prospective student-athletes for activities that give them no competitive advantage. As athletic directors, I'm sure you've experienced the difficulty of tracking the preenrollment activities of prospective student-athletes. It can be a nightmare. Why should we have rules and regulations that have become very hard to regulate, let alone enforce?

In conclusion, I'd like to make the following comments. Our task force today has brought before you what we believe to be in the best interest of Division III. Now we need your feedback and we need a sense of direction from the Division III membership. We are ready to craft legislation according to your wishes that would be brought back for the next NCAA Convention. We need to know what areas of amateurism reform you would be willing to support in order to help us in our endeavors. Thank you for your attention.

**Mr. Weingartner:** As Joann said, we come before you today to seek your direction. Are we headed in the right direction? Should we think about drafting legislation for our next meeting in 2002? What recommendations are you comfortable with? Where have we pushed the envelope perhaps a little too far? Please step forward.

**John Galaris** (Salem State College): First of all, let me congratulate the committee on their efforts in this regard. You certainly provided us with a great deal of information today. Personally, I was a little overwhelmed with the presentation in terms of trying to assimilate all the data that you gave us. I know that you're talking primarily about prospective student-athletes. Has any thought been given to the student who enrolls out of high school, goes a year or two, drops out and works for a couple of years? How does this legislation impact them? That's my first thought.

The other thing that I personally need is a complete copy of what was presented today to try to assimilate all the data. I'm very concerned about the definition of organized competition. That could be a nightmare in terms of trying to understand who is on your campus and who isn't. Those are just some very quick thoughts.

**Mr. Weingartner:** Thanks, John. I'm reminded that hard copy is on the Web site for the presentation. I don't know how to answer dropping out of high school. That student presumably would have to graduate from high school to be accepted at most of our institutions. Then the organized competition rule would apply and depend on whether or not that student had engaged in organized competition as we have defined it prior to his or her matriculating at one of our institutions.

**Carlyle Carter** (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I need a point of clarification. I believe John was asking the question about an enrolled student-athlete who leaves college, not a dropout from high school.

**Mr. Weingartner:** We have not taken up the issue of the enrolled student-athlete. This entire session has been devoted to talking about the prospective student-athlete. I think it's fair to say that we don't anticipate making recommendations for any significant change for enrolled student-athletes. We're happy with the NCAA — particularly in NCAA Division III — understanding of amateurism as it applies to our athletes.

**Mr. Carter:** That wasn't my question. Looking at the examples that you provided and having done some committee work, I realize how difficult it is to make those interpretations. It's certainly clear, through the examples you provided during the presentation, that our rules application of interpretations need to be reviewed and altered to ensure consistency and fairness. I certainly support repayment as well as charging prospective student-athletes with the same number of years of competition as they competed as a professional. I think we really need to do a good job in making sure that for every case that comes before the committee that does need evaluation or reinstatement, that the rules are applied equally and fairly.

The other question I have is what was the rationale used in assessing a year of residence?

**Mr. Weingartner:** The committees at the Divisions I, II and III level went back and forth on that issue. At different stages we did not include a year in residence. I think that we felt — Joann and Steve, please feel free to jump in here — that we wanted to see a commitment to education from those students who had gone out and participated in organized competition from what we've described as one, two or even three years. We felt more comfortable that there would be a real commitment to education and that would be reflected in the year of residence.

**John Biddiscombe** (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): Ever since the International Olympic Committee took away Jim Thorpe's medals, I think that our country has been fascinated about the controversy between amateurism and professionalism.

My comment really has to do with perception versus reality. I have a concern that the public and people on our Division III campuses, particularly faculty members, will have a strong reaction

about making these regulations in regard to professionalism much more permissive. My suggestion would be that as your committee moves forward, although it's not your charge, that the NCAA leadership and governance structure think about a plan to make sure that a public relations effort is made if in fact this new legislation is adopted at the next Convention to clearly clarify why the changes are made and how they will be impacted on the campuses. I don't think the public should have the perception that we're just giving into pressures in terms of professionalism.

The second concern I have is the unintended consequences for high-school athletics. Many times NCAA legislation is passed and therefore it has a major impact on high school or club sports that we haven't really thought through. I would hope the committee would take time in their deliberations to do some research and have conversations — if you haven't already done so — with high-school federations and school systems and principals to look at those consequences. Thank you.

**Mr. Weingartner:** Thank you, John. We'll note that.

**Linda Moulton** (Clark University, Massachusetts): I too applaud the committee's work, having served on some version of this committee previously. I have a couple of comments that are not really suggestions but direction. I think many of us, because the committee has taken time to lay this out for us, can understand the clear conflict and even severity of the penalty for the intent to professionalize. I think that's a good direction for the committee to be heading.

I think many of us can understand looking at pay for play or even necessary expenses. I think the larger issue, beyond what John Biddiscombe said, is that I'm not sure that I understand how having a preenrolled student-athlete who has an opportunity to play on a professional team, regardless of how many games he or she may play in, receive pay and how that cannot be understood as a competitive advantage. I think there probably needs to be some significant discussion and even clarification about how that could not disadvantage one institution over another.

**Mr. Weingartner:** We'll take that up at our next meeting.

**Zak Ivkovic** (City University of New York Athletic Conference): I'm not sure if the committee has taken into consideration some of the nontraditional students who we're dealing with. In our case, our median age of college students is well over 25. At some of our schools, up to 70 percent of our students also work 30-plus hours a week. These are not kids who are going from high school straight to college. They go to work to support their families and to earn money for their education. I think you need to take into consideration students who don't go directly to college from high school so they're not being punished for sitting out and for working in order to meet their goals of earning a college degree.

**Mr. Weingartner:** Thank you. That's a good point.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this issue. I know



this has been a lot to digest. Please contact members of the task force if you have opinions not expressed here today. We're eager to get a better sense of direction from the membership on this issue. Again, thanks very much. (Applause.)

**Ms. Die:** Our thanks to Tom and other members of the task force and staff for that report. You can see they are trying to steer in very choppy waters. As you've heard, it's especially important to continue to discuss the issue and monitor its evolution in the spring and summer since legislative changes would be proposed for consideration at next year's Convention. Your continued feedback and input to members of the task force and governance structure will be crucial if we are to successfully bring closure to this issue.

I will remind you that the NCAA Web site contains what you saw on this Powerpoint presentation. Go to the NCAA Web site, then go to the Convention section, then to Division III. It's a subheading under Conventions.

I'm very sorry to report that we will not be able to take a morning break due to the schedule and what we have to do between now and lunch. I would invite you to stand and stretch for about a minute and chat with the person next to you and then seat yourselves again very quickly. I know you may wish to take your own personal breaks now and then.

Our next report is a brief update from members of the Interpretations and Legislation Committee. It will focus on growing deregulation efforts as well as the remarkable new interpretations database that is now available online. Leading our discussion will be Suzanne Coffey, director of athletics at Bates College and chair of the Legislation and Interpretations Committee. Those of you still standing and talking, I ask you to give courtesy to our next speaker, please.

## **INTERPRETATIONS AND LEGISLATION COMMITTEE REPORT**

**Suzanne Coffey** (Bates College): Thank you, President Die. Our task this morning is to briefly summarize the work of the Interpretations and Legislation Committee with regard to the deregulation project. Steve Argo, my colleague from the Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference, and I will share the dais this morning as we walk the membership through the deregulation process. At the conclusion of our summary, you'll have the opportunity to be introduced to the LSDBi, the legislative services database.

Before we begin, I'd like to take this opportunity to recognize the talented and dedicated people I'm fortunate to work with on the ILC. In addition to Steve, there's Susan Chapman, Worcester State College; Garnett Purnell from Wittenberg; Sandra Slabik from Neumann College; Tim Gleason from the Ohio Athletic Conference; our student-athlete representative from Juniata College, Nathan Haggar; and our two very capable membership services staff members, Chris Martin and Kristen Davis.

The Division III strategic plan, designed by the Management and

Presidents Councils, calls for the deregulation of the Division III Manual. This complex task has consumed the committee's time and energy since restructuring four years ago. Deregulation has taken place in two phases. Phase I laid the groundwork for the establishment of a true Division III Manual by removing the references to Divisions I and II and by subsequently eliminating the numerical gaps left as a result of the removal of Divisions I and II legislation. Phase I was completed in time for legislative incorporation into the 2000-01 Manual.

Phase II has been a work in progress. The tasks in Phase II include the elimination of legislation with a genesis and current application that carry over from a nonfederated period. Legislation that was designed to address a Division I or II issue that was adopted as an Association-wide proposal and currently is applied primarily within Divisions I and II but not Division III has been forwarded to the membership in each of the last two Conventions as proposed deletions. Proposals 76 and 77, which eliminate legislation governing football bowl games and television plans, are examples of this effort.

Phase II also includes the deletion of legislation that is inconsistent with the Division III philosophy. Legislation should be an extension of our philosophy in Division III. Accordingly, legislation that either conflicted with or was not representative of the Division III philosophy statement has been removed through the legislative process that brings such recommendations to the membership.

As Steve will elaborate on in a moment, delivery of the legislation is also extremely important. The ILC has taken a good deal of action to assure that legislation is easy to understand. In an effort to simplify and clarify current legislation, we've incorporated key references to current legislation that indicate which other pieces of legislation should be reviewed in order to fully understand any single regulation.

The ILC has taken additional steps to delete repetitive legislation wherever it has made sense to do so. We have also taken action to standardize the terms used in legislation to refer to concepts like prospect, contest and student-athlete.

Lastly, the ILC has made recommendations that will bring consistency to the legislation. We particularly looked at Bylaw 17 for areas in which consistency is sensible, defensible and viable.

Steve Argo will now talk more about Bylaw 17 as he discusses the current work of the ILC.

**Steve Argo** (Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference): A lot of the current committee work is extremely important. We've spent a great deal of time exploring ways to deliver this legislation, particularly with the use of bylaw templates. Bylaw 17, for example, is playing seasons. I believe playing seasons will be the same bylaw number. The permissible number of contests will be the same site. We're trying to get some uniformity to all of this.

We've also looked at a glossary of terms. We've also looked at

glossary of terms is currently under development. There's been a great deal of work already, and I see a finished product not too far in to the future.

We've also looked at additional key references. As you know, the Manual is built around references. Being able to maneuver yourself around the Manual and additional references to other pieces of legislation should improve the accessibility.

Use of computer technology with our new legislative services database will be the LSDBi. The LSDBi will be Web based. The accessibility will be through the NCAA Web page. We had a presentation recently at our last meeting in Indianapolis. I found the presentation to be very, very helpful. I think the membership will have the opportunity to access references and Manual revisions a lot quicker than waiting on publications to come out. It also contains rules interpretations as well as the NCAA Division III Manual. I think having the Manual online will be an extreme improvement for the membership as we move along.

To give you an overview of the LSDBi, I'd like to introduce Wendy Walters of the NCAA membership services staff. Wendy was responsible for giving us our presentation in November. I think you'll find this presentation to be very helpful. Thank you.

**Wendy Walters** (NCAA Staff): Thank you. I'm going to give you a quick overview of the LSDBi and how to use the system. There is actually going to be additional training available at all of the regional seminars in New Orleans, D.C. and La Jolla. That will give you an additional opportunity to review the LSDBi system.

First, let's talk about how to access the LSDBi. It's available on the membership Web page. The address is [www.ncaa.org/databases/](http://www.ncaa.org/databases/). After you get on the membership page, you will click Legislative Services Database from the Internet. The user name for everyone in the membership is "member." The password is "LSDBi." Both the user name and the password are not case sensitive, so you can write those in lowercase or uppercase.

Once you go to the Web page and click on Legislative Services Database, this is the home page that you will see. You should be aware that the legislative services database is also available for the general public. You will notice that there's four blue buttons. There's a Manual bylaws button, a major infractions button, a download button, and an NCAA home button.

The general public will not have access to interpretations, but the membership will. To get access to the interpretations, you'll need to click on the logon, which is just underneath the NCAA logo. Once you click there, the dialogue box will appear and you should insert your name with "member" and your password of "LSDBi." Then click okay. Some browsers similar to this browser actually have a spot where you can put a check mark so that the system will remember your user name and password so you won't have to enter it each time you go to that page on the Web. You may want to check your browsers on your

campus.

Once you click okay, if you look at the four buttons again, there's now five. The interpretations button has been added. Also on this home page is a list of news items. This is an opportunity for the membership services staff, as well as other staffs within membership services, to post notices that we want to make the membership aware of. If we were going to click "recent interpretations," it would bring us to a list of the most recent interpretations that have been added to the system. You want to go to that page and be sure to check to see if there's anything new.

Now we're going to click the download button, which is a blue button. In the download area, it has the 1999-00 as well as the 2000-01 Manuals in an Adobe reader format. This actually allows you to download the Manual to your hard drive so you don't have to be on the Internet to look at the Manual. You can save it to your hard drive and look at it without being connected to the Internet.

Next we're going to click on the Manuals button. This is the area in which you can search the text of the Manual. You'll notice when it first comes up, it sets to Division I. You can change that to Division III. Then there's a finger with a red ribbon on it. If you click that finger after you send it to Division III, every time you open the system, it will automatically be set to Division III so you won't have to continually change that.

Now we're able to search by article number. You can search all the articles or you can search a particular article number. You can also search by specified bylaw number. For example, here is a search for Bylaw 13.2.2. Just below that, you'll see there's a little box that says "include adopted." The LSDBi system on the Internet will actually include the adopted bylaws. Once they become effective, they will no longer appear in red and they will appear seamless within the bylaw. So once we've put in 13.2.2, let's click "go search" to see what appears.

Here we have a list of all the bylaws in the Division III Manual that begin with 13.2.2. There are actually two ways you can access the text of that bylaw. If you want to see multiple bylaws, you insert the check mark and it would show you all the bylaws that you checked; or if you just want to look at one bylaw, you could simply click the text. Let's look at the actual text of 13.2.2.

Here we have the text of 13.2.2. The LSDBi system also shows you 13.2.1, which is the bylaw before. At the bottom, it will also have the bylaw immediately following 13.2.2. So you're actually able to click on those and scroll through the Manual that way as well as doing a search.

If we scroll down just below the text of 13.2.2, there are two items. Within the last month, the major infractions database was incorporated into the LSDBi. Here we have two cases that reference Bylaw 13.2.2. If we want to look at those cases, we would simply click on "major cases" so we could look at them.

Just below that are associated interps. These are all the interps on our system that reference Bylaw 13.2.2. If we wanted to look at these interps, we again could click the check box or the title and here we have the text of that interpretation.

You're able to print these interpretations or copy and paste them if you like into a Word document. When you print them, what prints is everything to the right of the logo. It does not print the logo; it does not print the Manual search buttons; it only prints the text of the interp. Just below the text of the interp are all the bylaws that are associated with that interp. Again, you could simply click the title of these bylaws or put a check mark in front of several bylaws and click "selected bylaws" and you could view the text of those bylaws. It's actually very easy to toggle back and forth between interpretation text and the actual bylaws that relate to that interpretation.

Now I'm going to click on the interpretation button to go to the interpretation search screen. There's one thing I want to mention from the Manual search screen. At the bottom, there's a section that's very similar to this interpretation screen for key word searches. So when I talk about the key word searches on the interpretation screen, they work the same way as the Manual search screen. We can search interps by official, we can search staff, we can search legislative assistance columns, as well as archived items. Again, you can search by division, you can search by article or a specified bylaw number.

You can also search interpretations by a range of dates. Here our default date that comes up is your beginning date of January 1, 1970, because we don't have any interpretations before that time. The date here is January 3, 2001, because that's when I created this Powerpoint. If we were actually on a live Internet connection, it would have today's date in there. You can also search for a very specific date by dropping down and clicking the button to the area that says "on date one" and then setting date one to the date you are interested in. You can see all the interpretations that were issued on that date.

Just below the date is the key word search area. To create a key word search, you're essentially creating a sentence. The sentence will begin in the interpretation box, and there's a drop-down box. If you look at that drop-down box, it has three options, the first being at least one of the words that works as an "or." You will no longer have to actually type the connectors of "or" and "and." That is done by choosing one of these three options. All of the words work as an "and." The system will look for exactly what you typed. For example, if you want to find interpretations on official visit, if you use the phrase, it will find interpretations that say "official visit," not just interpretations that have the words official and visit in it. It will look for that exact phrase.

So we're going to do a search, and I'm looking for an interpretation that includes 4.2.4. I will put a space but there's no need for me to put an "and." I'm putting the word to, space, and year. If I click "go

search,” which is just below, I will get a list of interpretations that have 4.2.4 to year in the interpretation text. So again, you can select multiple interpretations by placing a check mark in front or we can click on the item.

I’m going to click on the first item. Here’s the text of the first interpretation that we found. It includes the date it was issued. It’s item reference is number one. You’ll notice that the key words that we search for are now in red. So we know the system did pull up the correct item.

I’m now going to click on the major infractions button to show you their search screen. Here you have the option of searching by institution or conference. You can search all divisions. There’s also the ability to search by date, to search by the sports that were involved, as well as search by the penalty imposed. You can also search by the particular bylaw number, or by a key word. Here you can also list the institutions that are currently on probation as well as list the institutions that have had the most infractions.

The next thing I’m going to show you is where you get your help. Help is actually very important. There’s not a written document, but I can show you where you can go to print that out. On each search screen there are these yellow and blue question marks. The yellow question mark is the help for the screen that you’re on. It will take you into the help document and take you right to the help for the major infractions screen. For example, where we’re at right now if we clicked the yellow question mark.

The blue question mark, which is also on each search screen, will take you to the beginning of the help document. If you want to print that out, click the blue question mark. It will open a separate window. Use your browser to print the help document. Within that help document, there are additional connectors that can be used to help you refine your search.

That’s my presentation on the overview of LSDBi. If you have any questions, I can answer them at this time.

**Carlyle Carter** (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I have less of a question and more of a comment. I also serve as the compliance officer for our conference. Serving 13 institutions that ask questions and interpretations, I want to applaud you and whoever is responsible for the LSDBi. I’ve used it since it’s come out. It’s not as complicated as you might think. I’m not a computer geek, although I do use computers every day. I find that the ease of use in finding interpretations in some cases are a lot easier than trying to get in touch with a membership services person, although they do an excellent job. It is by far the best advancement for me in executing my duties as compliance officer that we’ve had to date. Thank you. (Applause.)

**Wendy Walters** (NCAA Staff): Thank you very much for your time.

**Suzanne Coffey** (Bates College): Thank you, Wendy. As Carlyle

said, I do think this is a real significant step forward. Thanks to the membership services staff and all of those at the NCAA responsible for making this happen. This concludes our report this morning. Thank you for your attendance and your attention. (Applause.)

**Ms. Die:** Thanks to the committee members for their report. I would like to commend them for their ongoing efforts to deregulate the Manual. I know all of our members wish to see the Manual as deregulated as possible. I'm sure at times this feels like an exhaustive effort, but we have made tangible progress toward deregulation during the last few years. Thanks for your leadership. I also want to congratulate the committee and staff responsible for the new database. I'm sure you will agree that it is a major improvement over the former version. It makes a remarkable amount of information directly available on your desktop.

We will spend the rest of the morning discussing financial aid issues. Proposal No. 46 and the related amendments, 46-1 and 46-2, represent important milestones in our attempt to implement financial aid legislation that is more consistent with our philosophy statement and strategic plan. This session will give you an opportunity to review those proposals in detail, ask questions, and be sure that you have the opportunity to pass an informed vote on the proposals this afternoon. It also is important that you have an appreciation of our overall plan to address financial aid issues during the next few years since this issue is of such fundamental importance to our division. I would like to invite members of the financial aid committee to make their respective presentations at this time.

## **FINANCIAL AID COMMITTEE REPORT**

**Georgette DeVeres** (Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges): Good morning. I had the privilege of chairing the Financial Aid Committee this past year. At Claremont McKenna College, I'm the associate vice-president of admission and financial aid. I'm here to begin the presentation of the work of this committee for this past year.

I would like to first share with you the committee members who served this past year. As you can see, we have a full committee. Some members of the committee will also be presenting different aspects of this morning's presentation. We will go through a very brief agenda to give you an update of the current process. You will get a little more detailed information about Proposal No. 46. I also will continue to discuss the concepts of compliance and enforcement. We'll go over in some detail a time line for implementation. Hopefully, you'll have some questions for us to respond to. We have some questions prepared for you.

In 1997, the steering committee created the Division III Financial Aid and Awards Committee and charged the committee to review the institution's submission of the award of circumstance awards and nonathletic achievement awards, per NCAA Bylaws

15.4.6.3 and 15.4.6.4, in an attempt to uphold the Division III philosophy in monitoring athletically related financial aid for the student. That's been the whole premise of our committee's work and the philosophy of Division III.

This process entailed institutions across the country, all 400-plus of us, to submit descriptions from our institutional publications, such as catalogs and Web sites, to give information to the committee about the awards of circumstance and nonathletic achievement award. Over the last four years, the committee has been reviewing these award descriptions to see if they are in compliance with the criteria for the award of circumstance and nonathletic achievement award to see if in fact the schools are meeting the criteria to award those type of financial aid packages to students.

You've already heard several times this morning, and I think President Die's comments summed it up very good in opening remarks, that the process has not been an efficient process. But needless to say, over the four-year period, the good news is that we have completed the review of the awards that have been submitted to us and we are 94 percent complete in terms of responding to all institutions. There are a few institutions that are still in the follow-up process, but we anticipate that will be completed by June 2001.

The reason for the discussion of changing the process is that basically the process we just completed did not get to the heart of the matter of attempting to see if financial aid packages are awarded consistently for all students at institutions — for student-athletes as well as nonstudent-athletes. It did not yield the desired results. We did not know the compositions of financial aid packages for student-athletes and nonstudent-athletes. Therefore, we could not determine if financial aid packages were awarded consistently among the two populations of students, as specified by NCAA Bylaw 15.4.8.

So as we look at the current process, it always has been the case that we need to determine whether aid is being awarded consistently for student-athlete populations in comparison to the general student population. As I indicated, this process, even though it's taken a very long period of time, even though it gave us the award descriptions in terms of how awards can be determined at institutions, it still did not give us the basis for determining whether packages were awarded consistently to all students at institutions.

So Proposal 46 is the result of this year's committee's recommendation to move forward. It will not change the current legislative criteria in terms of the philosophy of Division III financial aid, but it would change the process in how we will evaluate it and if in fact institutions are in compliance in awarding financial aid to student-athletes. At this point, I think that we'll have Terry give us a little more detailed information about Proposal 46.

**Terry Rupert** (Wilmington College, Ohio): Thank you, Georgetown.

Proposal 46 was developed by the committee and endorsed by the



Division III Management Council and the Presidents Council. The intent of this proposal is to simplify Bylaw 15 and establish a process that will address the Division III philosophy statement to award no athletic aid and provide aid on a consistent basis to student-athletes and students in general. We're not getting into reinventing the wheel. We're basically simplifying Bylaw 15. The proposal does not change any of the legislative requirements other than limiting the current award review process.

This proposal simplifies Bylaw 15 by placing the bylaws in a more logical order. If you've ever looked at Bylaw 15, you know it's all over the place. It removes references not applicable to Division III, eliminates the current review process and categorization of nonathletic achievement awards.

The question I think a lot of us have is: What does it do? Proposal 46 does not discourage institutional autonomy by creating a new standard for financial aid. The legislation has not changed, with the exception of the review process that will be reordered and simplified. Institutions will be able to award aid according to the needs of the institution. An example of that is track students, because of certain demographics, who can still continue provided that the athletic ability and participation are not considered.

It does not create additional requirements for institutions. Actually, Proposal 46 reduces the requirements by eliminating the current award process. Currently, it does not create additional costs. The next step is proposed models. This is merely a simplification of Bylaw 15, so there's no additional cost. The effective date is delayed until August of 2002 to allow the committee to finalize efforts to create a new compliance and enforcement process. This will get voted on in January 2002 and permit ample time for the membership to give us your comments.

We're going into a model here. This is not part of Proposal 46; this is merely a model. The committee has developed and we'll share with you some examples of models we're looking at that will provide some data to determine whether an institution is awarding financial aid on a consistent basis to student-athletes and students in general.

The proposed process has two parts. Before I get into these two parts, let me say this. All of the details for these models are preliminary. They can be changed later. The committee can better define this model based upon the membership input we hope to get from you today. The Management Council and Presidents Council will also get the final stamp of approval on this before the vote at the 2002 Convention.

The first part of the two-part process that we're looking at is basically an institutional checklist, which we call a "compliance checklist" that we'll talk about in a few minutes. The intent of the checklist is to provide the institution with an instrument that can be used to perform a self-check. The checklist is to help identify an institution's strengths and weaknesses in regard to financial aid. This will

be sent out on a yearly basis, as are other compliance materials that are sent to us. This will be sent back to the national office and kept on file. Currently, we're looking at a simple checklist — merely “yes” and “no” questions — along with this model example that we're going to talk about.

The model example on the screen is during an institutional annual federal audit. An auditor will randomly select 10 percent of the institution's students as a population to be compared to the student population. In order to be considered in compliance with Bylaw 15.4.8, the audit report must indicate consistent distribution of financial aid regarding the average amount and type of financial aid provided to the students who attended the institution during the prior year. It also will look at average need of students who attend the prior year and if the percentage of total dollar value of institutionally administered grants awarded to student-athletes is closely equivalent to the percentage of student-athletes within the student body. That is, are you awarding as you say you were awarding?

An audit result shall be reported on a form on an annual basis to the member conference or, in the case of an independent, to the Financial Aid and Awards Committee. I want to reemphasize that this is an example. This is not what we have voted on yet. This will be voted on in 2002. Reports of noncompliance would then be forwarded to the enforcement staff for appropriate review and disposition.

Let me again emphasize that this is where we're at in the model. It is not what we're voting on after lunch. We're looking at Proposal 46 as a simplification of Bylaw 15. There's also some discussion on some possible subsidizing by the governance staff in proposed future budgets if there is additional cost to run these kinds of audits. Those are things we need to talk about.

I want to reemphasize that this is not final and institutions will have time to comment. The audit models are separate from Proposal 46. Linda Case will talk about the time line for implementation of these models and these checklists.

**Linda Case** (State University College at Brockport): Thank you, Terry. This time line for implementation has been approved by the Management Council and the Presidents Council. As you can see, in January 2001 at the Convention we were supposed to update you on the status of our current review process and discuss Proposal No. 46. What comes with that is the compliance and enforcement process that we'd like to put before you and have the membership vote on next year.

In March 2001, you'll receive the Division III Guide to Financial Aid. It will be sent to all institutions to finalize the compliance checklist that Terry talked about in considering alternative enforcement strategies. Throughout April and May, there will be financial aid presentations made at the NCAA regional rules seminars. Legislative recommendations will be forwarded to the Management Council and

the Presidents Council for next year's Convention.

In June, a financial aid presentation will be made at the NACDA convention. There will be a lot of opportunity for people to give some feedback to the compliance process. The committee will finalize the compliance checklist and mail it out to the membership either through a revised ISSG or through the financial aid and compliance forms that you receive in the summer. There will also be a financial aid presentation made at the Division III conference commissioners meeting in July and August of 2001, and we will forward a draft of the checklist about the methodology and the process for data collection, enforcement recommendations, and the legislation to the Management Council, the membership and the Presidents Council. Additionally, there will be another presentation made at the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators convention. In October 2001, we will forward the final draft of the checklist process, the methodology and the enforcement methodology to the Management Council and the Presidents Council.

That brings us to next year's Convention where we'll vote on the legislation, if that's applicable. If that passes, we move on to March 2002 when there will be a distribution of the Division III financial aid and compliance checklist, the methodology, and the enforcement process to the membership. In August 2002, the legislation will become effective. The compliance process will begin. NCAA financial aid legislation will be included in the institutions' annual federal audit.

I'd like to turn it over now to Ellen Shilkret, the associate director of financial aid at Vassar. She will address some of the frequently asked questions that have been brought to our attention. Thank you.

**Ellen Shilkret** (Vassar College): Thank you, Linda. Here are some of the frequently asked questions that have come to the committee:

On what basis may aid be awarded? Aid may be awarded on any basis other than athletic ability or participation.

May we provide leadership awards? Yes, as long as the criteria to determine the recipients do not consider athletic ability or participation.

Does Proposal 46 create a new legislative standard? The answer to that is "no." It's simplifying Bylaw 15 by placing the bylaws in a more logical order. It eliminates the current review process and categorization of awards of circumstance and nonathletic achievement awards, and it removes references that are not applicable to Division III.

Do the proposed audit procedures create a national standard for financial aid? No. The audit methodology is going to use a percentage of student-athlete files, approximately 10 percent, that will be compared with the students generally at an individual institution. Therefore, the number of files that will be reviewed will be specific for

each institution as opposed to a set number of files to be reviewed for all institutions. In other words, if your college had a total of 1,000 student-athletes, the 10-percent rule would have only 100 of those student-athlete files removed.

What are the budget implications of the audit enforcement mechanism? The estimated cost is between \$3,000 and \$5,000. Of course, that would be directly affected by the number of files the auditor must review. In other words, the smaller the program, the smaller the program would be charged and vice versa.

At this time, I'd like to also just mention that the Division III Presidents Council and Management Council are supporting this audit process.

What are the penalties for noncompliance audit reports? Financial aid violations will be handled in the same manner as any other violation. NCAA Bylaw 19 and enforcement staff policies and procedures would govern.

Does Proposal No. 46 include the compliance checklist and proposed audit procedures? No, it does not. All it's doing is simplifying Bylaw 15 by placing the bylaws in a more logical order, eliminating the current review process and removing preferences not applicable to Division III.

At this time, I'd like to turn the program back to Georgette DeVeres, who will open up the floor to any questions you may have. Thank you.

**Ms. DeVeres:** We attempted to identify some questions that we thought were pertinent to this discussion. We understand there might be some questions from the floor. There may be some need to offer further clarification in terms of the direction we're going. Are there any questions from the floor?

**Arleigh Dodson** (Northwest Conference): This is a comment on the audit. Our conference has not always audited all of our students and student-athletes on financial aid and made the comparison. When we go to the table, if there's any deviation between the general student body and the student-athletes, the individual names go on the table and they're discussed. The institution has to provide the rationale for the difference. So the key to us is sitting at that table and going over any differences that would fall out of the audit.

The trouble is, there's only one reason that pops people out and that's in 15.2.4.1, exempted government grants. An exempted government grant is the one that puts the name on the table. We dispose of it instantly because we just say exempted government grant. If you're going to take it to an outside auditor, they either have to flag exempted government grants or have an opportunity to get it back to the institution to answer why they would be out of compliance because of an exempted government grant.

**Ms. DeVeres:** Your point is well taken. I think one of the things that Terry emphasized with his comments is that these are all proposals that are being developed in terms of the audit process. We

anticipate as the audit process continues that we will find things like that and that the committee will take exactly into account what you said — that there are certain exceptions that you have to accept through this process.

But as this whole procedure begins, these type of things will be taken into account. But your point is well taken. You're absolutely right. There are a certain type of governmental grants that students are entitled to and are able to receive.

**Shirley Liddle** (Beaver College): What's the reason that the committee opted for the randomly selected 10 percent as opposed to the whole freshman class of athletes?

**Ms. DeVeres:** I'll respond and let some members of the committee respond as well. We were modeling after the federal audit that most financial aid offices at some point in time have to go through. The Department of Education every year at some institutions will take a percentage of the population to audit. That's pretty much what the random sample model came from. Anyone want to add anything to that? There is a cost factor as well. The more students you audit, the more the cost is going to be.

**Ms. Liddle:** Thank you.

**Wallace Neel** (Bethany College, West Virginia): We've done this at our conference in the past. Is there going to be an average of the student population versus an average of the 10 percent, or are they going to be specific individual audits going to be compared? Because the averages tend to blend, we've found massive things that are incomprehensible in comparison.

The second word I have is that there's a weasel word in there called "closely." I'm not sure when you closely compare things, what does that mean and how is that going to be defined?

**Ms. DeVeres:** I've just been advised by NCAA staff that "closely" is already in the bylaw, so that's the reason why closely is part of the language.

As far as the first part of your question about average, Terry, do you want to come back since you gave that part of the presentation and comment about that?

**Terry Rupert** (Wilmington College, Ohio): From what we talked about, this is still in the discussion stage. We're looking at zero tolerance. We weren't looking at an average. If there's a definite distinction between the general student population and the student-athlete to award, it's not an average.

**Leon Lunder** (Carleton College): The reference on Page 63, 15.01.5 in the new legislative proposal concerning athletics funds or endowments: "No part of an institution's financial aid budget shall be set aside either for particular sports or for athletics in general, nor may an institution establish athletically related quotas of financial aid recipients. . ." I have a question. I've become aware that some institutions in Division III have what we call "slots" for athletes for sports. How does that legislation affect those slots as far as financial

aid is concerned?

**Ms. DeVeres:** That is in violation of current legislation. There are no slots.

**Mr. Lunder:** Thank you. (Laughter.)

**Don Harnum** (Susquehanna University): I must admit to you that hearing the questions just offered to the dais and hearing the presentation on the audit procedure literally makes my stomach turn. I have been an athletic director in Division III for 23 years. I've seen it work extremely well. I have cherished being in Division III and not in Division I where I coached previously and have some coaching in Division I now. I see what they all go through. I think that moving toward any kind of an audit procedure is heading down a slippery slope toward a huge volume of legislative regulations.

I think that if you looked at my model as a Division III athletic director, I do the scheduling, I'm the compliance officer, I'm the director of facilities, I'm the director of events, and then I'm going to have to compile some complicated procedure to make sure all my athletes are in line and they're all on the rosters properly. Knowing exactly which student-athlete is and who isn't on a team, when they left a team and how are we going to pick from this 10 percent? This is just a rat's nest. I think we ought to avoid it and start trusting each other so we can avoid this entire process altogether.

**Ms. DeVeres:** Thank you for your comments. Linda would like to respond to your statement.

**Linda Case** (State University College at Brockport): The audit procedure will be a checklist institution-wide to make sure that we are complying with Division III regulations. This will not entail any more work for the athletic administrator offices. This will come in your federal audit that's done in your financial aid office, which probably many of you are not even aware of or have no participation in. All that will be required as athletic directors is to supply our financial aid office with a list of our current rosters. They will do the random sample and they will do the comparisons. It will not involve the athletic administrator offices. The audit procedure is a checklist to make sure that institutions are doing the things we should for our student-athletes as well as our general student population.

**Ms. DeVeres:** As Linda said, audits are not foreign to a financial aid office. We have those quite frequently.

**Steve Wallo** (Lewis and Clark College): First of all, I'd like to commend the committee. I think you're doing some fantastic work on financial aid, which is one of the things that maintains a level playing field. I know it's not easy work.

As Arleigh pointed out, in the Northwest Conference we do use a method that looks at all of our student-athletes. While I'm not suggesting that we would do that nationwide, I am a little bit concerned about the 10-percent number. I would urge the committee to make sure we do some good research on whether that ends up being a number that is consistently relevant.

I'm afraid that while the example was if we have 1,000 student-athletes, we would be comparing 10-percent, meaning 100, many of our schools don't have 1,000 student-athletes. That 10 percent number, with the amount of flexible factors that there are in financial aid packaging, financial aid legitimately could end up showing, or be perceived to show that we have problems, in which case our enforcement staff, which is going to be limited in nature, will be spending a lot of time chasing down places where there really aren't problems.

I would just encourage you to do some studies on whether 10 percent is really going to be enough to really show whether or not there are problems at an institution.

**Ms. DeVeres:** Thank you for your comments. The committee spent a lot of time debating and discussing if 10 percent actually was a statistically sound sample. We received feedback from experts in the research area that 10 percent in fact is a valid percentage, even though there may be some question about that. But statistically, it is a valid group.

**Jeff Ankrom** (Wittenberg University): As a former member of the committee, I'd like to also commend you for the work you've done this year. I think it makes a lot of sense to get rid of those awards of circumstance and nonathletic achievement awards. I can remember sitting through many meetings with stacks and stacks of papers, and it was quite frustrating to me. So that part makes a lot of sense.

The question was asked a couple of minutes ago from the mike about how this mechanism would work. That is a very important question. The question, as I understood it, was when we determine a compliance mechanism next year, will we compare averages for student-athletes and nonstudent-athletes adjusted by aid? The answer is clearly "yes" by the way the new Bylaw 15.4.1 is constructed; but the controlling clause there says that all of these criteria will have to be met.

I don't really have a problem with the idea found in Item E on Page 70, which would be a part of the new 15.4.1. But when you look at the two phrases that are found there, a consistent financial aid package and the notion that financial aid packages cannot be clearly distinguishable, the legislation also does say that this will be done on a student-by-student basis.

I have more of a problem with that. I ask the membership to think seriously about this issue before we go too far down this road. I would say that it's quite possible that an institution could be consistently applying its methodology to its prospective students and student-athletes. Another institution could be using a methodology that is consistently applied by it. This could be quite a complicated algorithm that is used at both institutions.

I've had my eyes opened not only by my work on this committee, but also by the fact that I have a senior in high school this year who will be going to college. Some of these colleges now are using algorithms that are quite complicated. So I guess I really wonder and

don't know if this analogy holds very well. In the world of business, if firms were asked to reveal their pricing mechanism to some association or members of the state cartel, I don't think that would get very far. I'm asking if my institution or all of the institutions in Division III are willing to basically lay their pricing rules out on the table so that each individual student aid package could be monitored in this way.

I'm going with you guys on about 90 percent of this. But I'm going to be listening carefully to see how 15.4.1-(d) is going to play out, because it clearly says that a financial aid package for a student-athlete must be equivalent to packages to other student-athletes with similar need characteristics. But it doesn't indicate that other factors used in an algorithm might indicate consistent financial aid strategy.

**Ms. DeVeres:** Okay, Jeff. Are you finished? (Laughter.)

The committee is conferring. The preface of our whole model is a consistent financial aid package on your campus, not in comparison to other institutions. You're not going to be necessarily revealing anything that you're not doing consistently for all your students on your campus. I'm not sure if that is getting to the root of your question or not. But that's basically the purpose of the whole audit process — to see if whatever your policies are on your campus in awarding financial aid are consistently applied to all students and student-athletes are not singled out and packaged differently.

You're still looking at me and pondering. I'm not sure if that's the answer to your question.

**Mr. Ankrom:** I'm sure the discussion will continue later. I want to say that I hear that C and E could potentially be in conflict with each other.

**Ms. DeVeres:** Okay. Thank you.

**Jim Appleton** (University of Redlands): I want to support the good work you're doing on Proposal 46. The action needs to be passed this year. I think it's terrific. I would also want our institution to eventually support an audit process.

I want to follow up on Jeff's comment. I think he has struck a very, very important point. Actually, it has to do with assuring enough sophistication in the audit process, along with the simplicity, to ensure that we can implement it by our guidelines. It needs to be consistent within a given institution.

Many of our institutions have a very complex matrix form — and you're aware of this — of allocating financial aid. If individual student-athletes are compared with any average at the institution or overall number, it may appear to be out of compliance. If a given student-athlete is compared to other nonathletes within similar matrices or a similar matrix, then that would be a different way to take a look at it.

So rather than get into that detail, I just want to push Jeff's point to make sure that the guidelines established in the audit enable the individual institutions to in fact compare a student-athlete with a



nonstudent-athlete according to the way they allocate financial aid. We could get ourselves tied up into some serious complexities if that's not the case.

**Ms. DeVeres:** Again, I'd like to just reiterate that in financial aid, people are accustomed to going through audits. Depending on their policies, it's very possible that something may appear to be inconsistent but in fact is defensible based on the population of that institution and has sound reasons why some student-athletes may appear to be packaged a little differently. It could be from the socio-economic group that they are from. That's a possible defensible reason for why that particular audit result yielded that type of result.

I think your point is well taken. As we formulate the audit models, we will definitely take into account all the comments that are being made here. But this is the very beginning of the process.

**Michael Gentile** (Empire Eight Conference): I have a couple of questions. If an institution were to develop an award that would contemplate the use of athletic participation and make that award to nonstudent-athletes but not to student-athletes, is that something contemplated by this legislation and how would that be affected by the voting process?

As for the second question, I believe Terry mentioned in his report that the audit report form would be sent to the member conference, which then would be forwarded to the enforcement staff if noncompliance was found. Does the institution make the determination of noncompliance? Is it more or less a self-report or does the member conference then make the determination and make the report to the enforcement staff?

**Ms. DeVeres:** Let me respond to your second question first. Generally, in the process of an audit, the auditor is going to be reporting out to whatever level is determined what the results are for that institution. That is under discussion. It could be the conference or it could go directly to the Financial Aid and Awards Committee.

**Terry Rupert** (Wilmington College, Ohio): That really hasn't been decided yet. It's something we're talking about. But the auditor will report his or her findings to the CEO. Where we go from there — whether it goes to the conference or comes back to this committee — is open for discussion.

**Ms. DeVeres:** I'm trying to recap your first question. Basically, your question was if you had an award that had athletic participation criteria and it went to a nonstudent-athlete...

**Mr. Gentile:** ...it can no longer go to a student-athlete. How is that affected? Is that contemplated by the legislation and would that affect the audit?

**Ms. DeVeres:** Technically, an institution shouldn't have an award that is based on athletic participation, either to a nonathlete or to a student-athlete.

**Mr. Gentile:** But they could develop one now.

**Ms. DeVeres:** They can go to a nonstudent-athlete? Gordon, why

don't you respond to this?

**Gordon Finch** (NCAA Staff): Under the current legislation, a student-athlete is prohibited from receiving an award that is based on their athletic participation or athletic ability. If you have an award based on that, it cannot be given to a student-athlete. However, if a nonstudent-athlete, a band member, were to receive that award, that's not going to be against the legislation. It should affect the audit as well.

**Mr. Gentile:** That brings up one last question. In current legislation, I believe it relates to athletic ability, not participation. Now the language has changed in that respect. Is that something that the committee would consciously recommend?

I believe the current legislation on the books now relates to athletics ability as a major criteria. It now removes that language and adds the term "athletics participation." Is that a conscious effort to resolve any ambiguity?

**Mr. Finch:** If you're referring to the proposal, it generally does not change the legislative standard as it stands currently. Athletics ability and participation are not supposed to be considered.

**Mr. Gentile:** Thank you.

**Greg Fredricks** (Lewis and Clark College): Since the legislation that we asked to look at this afternoon involves an exception to consistent packaging based on difference in need levels for athletes versus nonathletes, I was wondering if your committee looked at the statistical validity of looking at only need when almost all of our institutions base their financial aid packages not only on need, but also on the other variables, like academic ability, minority status, etc.

**Ms. DeVeres:** Again, we get back to what is your formula for consistent packaging for students? If it's multiple variables, are those multiple variables being applied to all students on your campus?

**Mr. Fredricks:** The legislation says you can justify inconsistent packaging based only on one of the variables.

**Ms. DeVeres:** I was told that the committee needs to continue to review that point. That will be something that will continue to be discussed and evaluated.

**Dick Kaiser** (Defiance College): I think my question is fairly simple to answer. Are all of these various types of audits or methods of audits that you are attempting to look at and then hopefully get in place institutionally self-financed?

**Ms. DeVeres:** Yes. This has been supported by the Presidents Council and the Management Council. That is the reason why it's been recommended to be coupled with the federal audit that already takes place, because these are self-financed by institutions. However, there has been discussion to provide subsidy to institutions that may need it to help with the cost of the audit. It's important to know that your Presidents Council is in support of this. The presidents are obviously approving the budget of your institution, and the Presidents Council supports this type of process.

**Richard Herline** (Medaille College): For a college such as the one I represent, we have two or three very distinct student populations. Financial aid is awarded on a different basis depending on the population. What is the 10 percent of the nonstudent-athletes going to take into account?

**Ms. DeVeres:** It's not 10 percent of the nonstudent-athletes it's 10 percent of your athletes in general. It's 10 percent of students generally.

**Mr. Herline:** To be compared with what?

**Ms. DeVeres:** With your overall student body.

**Mr. Herline:** That's my point.

**Ms. DeVeres:** The student-athlete population is compared to the overall student population. It's 10 percent of your student-athletes compared to the overall student population.

**Mr. Herline:** Right. My point is that institutions that have very distinct student populations, for example, traditional first-time freshmen and nontraditional, it will be skewed if the 10 percent is taken and the student-athletes are compared with the entire population of nonstudent-athletes.

**Ms. DeVeres:** That's an example of how a school would be able to defend the results of their audit, because of that profile of their institution.

**Kristen Ford** (Ithaca College): I think it's important that we get some further clarification on the interpretation of the criteria for leadership scholarships, for example. If you refer to Page 62 of the Convention Notice, the current legislation as it's written states that athletic ability cannot be considered for the awarding of any kind of financial aid. But it makes reference to the fact that general participation in athletics can be considered but not as a major criteria. To flip the perspective a little bit, if we are awarding financial aid packages blindly or consistent with nonathletes, we don't know who the athletes are when they apply for these particular scholarships.

With this new language, are we going to have to remove — I guess I'm asking the question in this case — “participation in athletics” completely from the application from the front end? Does that mean that a student who applies for a particular scholarship at our respective institutions and has no intention of competing in athletics cannot use his or her athletic participation in high school as a criteria for leadership development? Is that an accurate interpretation of the way the new legislation is written?

**Ms. DeVeres:** To begin with, the legislation language has not changed from what was previously...

**Ms. Ford:** On Page 63 it says it combines participation and performance as being not eligible for consideration. The old legislation says “participation” as opposed to “ability.” They're two separate words. They mean two different things.

**Ms. DeVeres:** Gordon, would you like to respond to that, please?

**Mr. Finch:** Under the current legislation, it is not acceptable to

consider athletics ability or participation. In the leadership award, that's not going to change. If I understand your question correctly, the legislation will not change with the adoption of this proposal. The same legislative standard will be applicable. I hope that answers your question.

**Ms. DeVeres:** It's time to conclude our discussion. Thank you very much for your input. Obviously, we want to hear more from you throughout the year as we develop this process. (Applause.)

**Ms. Die:** Our thanks to the committee members for their presentation. We look forward to further discussion and voting on these proposals this afternoon. After lunch we will return to this room and reconvene at 1 o'clock sharp.

Our first order of business this afternoon will be to consider the various legislative proposals in our Convention Notice and Program. After our voting, we will take a brief break and then open the window of reconsideration. Walter Johnson will handle those legislative sessions. We will conclude with our championships discussion and appointment of our new Management Council members. Our afternoon is full, so I urge you to return promptly after lunch. Thank you and enjoy your lunch.

## **Afternoon Session**

### **Monday, January 8, 2001**

**Ms. Die:** I would like to invite Walter Johnson, chair of the Division III Management Council, to please lead us through this process.

#### **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS**

**Walter Johnson** (North Central College): If we could have the ushers take everybody to their seats. Oh, we don't have ushers, I'm sorry. Good afternoon. Being here today really helps me understand how my father feels. Some of you might know, because I've mentioned in the past, that my father is a Pentecostal minister. So I stand here and I look out on the congregation and the prosperous look of everyone that's here and full bellies that everyone has and I know what he always drew as something very clear: Half of you are excited and waiting to hear the sermon; the other half can't wait until it's over. (Laughter.) We will do our best to get all of us through this process as quickly and as proficiently as possible.

Joining us on the dais at this time is Lynn Holzman, a legislative coordinator with the membership services staff. She will assist us in the interpretation of issues as needed. We will consider a total of 32 legislative proposals. These are Proposal Nos. 46 through 77 in your Convention Notice. We will also consider two related amendments-to-amendments. We will vote on those proposals in numerical order as listed in Appendix A of the Convention Notice on Pages 111 and 112. In addition, you will find the editorial corrections on Pages 4 and 5 of

your Convention Program.

Before I move forward, at your seats you should have received a sheet that says "Mootnicity Issues." Mootnicity, for those of you who don't know, is an NCAA term you will not find anywhere else in society. But it does give you some sense of what will occur once another action takes place. If we pass a particular proposal, it tells you where the other pieces of that proposal and other related proposals will wind up going.

Proposals 46 through 54 make up the Presidents Council grouping. We will begin with those proposals and conduct roll call electronic votes. Remember, any motion related to the proposal and related amendments-to-amendments must also be determined by electronic roll-call vote.

Please remember you will need both your voting paddle and your electronic voting unit during our business session. Our procedures dictate that all votes be done either by paddle or electronically than by voice or hand. Because we intend to use the wireless voting unit today, I would like to take a few moments to point out a few things about that system. Point No. 1, it's not the same system as last year. (Laughter and applause.) Excuse us. We have technical difficulties. (Laughter.) Anyway, it sounds like everybody is pleased we're not using that same system. Apparently, the old system is now the property of Katherine Harris in the Florida election world.

[Note: Electronic voting procedures were explained.]

As we begin, I would like to remind you that for the benefit of our court reporter, please state your name and institution when you are recognized by the chair at one of the numbered microphones. We will begin by considering Proposal No. 46.

### **Financial Aid Regulations**

**Bill Eng** (Bernard M. Baruch College): As a member of the Management Council and Financial Aid and Awards Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

As you heard this morning, this proposal will simplify Bylaw 15, permitting the award review and approval process for awards of circumstance and nonathletic achievement awards. This is the only fundamental legislative change contained in the proposal. All legislative changes are editorial in nature as the existing bylaws are merely rearranged in more simple and logical order. Also, 46 reinforces the existing principle that financial aid packaging for Division III student-athletes must be consistent with packaging for students in general. This will help ensure compliance with our philosophy statement that no athletic-related financial aid shall be awarded to any students.

The underlying compliance process is not legislated in this proposal. Rather, if Proposals 46-1 and 46-2 are adopted, legislation will be proposed for next year's Convention to provide the membership

with the opportunity to review the details and voice opinion on the compliance process over the next year.

The committee has worked hard to present the legislative packages as responsive to the feedback we have received and remain true to our philosophy statement. I can assure you that the committee will remain dedicated to that goal over the next year. On behalf of the Presidents Council, Management Council and Financial Awards Committee, I urge you to support this proposal. Thank you.

**Stan Caine** (Adrian College): As a member of the Presidents Council, I move the adoption of Proposal 46-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment will delay the effective date of Proposal 46 until August 1, 2002. It will give the membership more time to prepare for the implementation of this proposal. In particular, the Financial Aid and Awards Committee needs additional time to develop details of the comprehensive compliance and enforcement process and to communicate that plan to the membership.

You heard a number of committee members this morning describe the proposed audit concept, but the committee needs time to develop additional details with regard to that proposal and also to receive more formal feedback from the membership about available alternatives. I'm confident the procedures can be worked out with enough time and input.

This amendment and Proposal 46-2 are significant components of our overall effort to establish financial aid legislation that is realistic, effective and consistent with our philosophy statement. Thank you.

**Oscar Page** (Austin College): I'm a member of the Presidents Council. I encourage the delegates to vote in support of this amendment to delay the implementation date to August 1, 2002. It's important we have adequate time to develop an appropriate enforcement strategy and to support the Financial Aid Committee. The committee simply needs additional time to develop details related to this implementation. I think we all will appreciate the good work that they do next year.

[Proposal 46-1 was adopted, 339-2-0.]

### **Approval of Financial Aid Compliance Process**

**Dick Rasmussen** (University Athletic Association): On behalf of members of the University Athletic Association and the Division III Presidents Council, I move Proposal 46-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

While the many changes to Bylaw 15 included in Proposal 46 will simplify the Division III financial aid legislation, this proposal in its original form is incomplete because it does not include any specifics with regard to the intended formal compliance process as suggested in the statement of rationale.

Institutions in Division III maintain financial aid programs that process hundreds, and in many cases thousands, of individual aid awards to prospective student-athletes each year. Several times those numbers of awards are processed for enrolled students annually. These institutional programs oversee awarding and disbursement of loans for books and other need-based federal, state and institutional sources, as well as an increasing array of institutional awards based on factors other than need. These programs range in design from traditional efforts to simply meet the financial need of prospective students to complex systems of enrollment management.

Because of the volume and complexity of many of these institutional programs, any process that requires the compilation and/or recording of substantial amounts of current data regarding awards of student-athletes and other students has the potential to have significant impact on the staff resources of member institutions. Therefore, it is proper and necessary that member institutions should have the opportunity to review the details in any such compliance process in a legislative format and vote upon their ultimate approval before adoption and implementation.

**Oscar Page** (Austin College): On behalf of the Presidents Council and the Management Council, I want to encourage each of you to support Proposal 46-2, which would develop the appropriate compliance process.

As you heard this morning, the Financial Aid and Awards Committee is researching practical ways to enforce compliance with our revised financial aid requirements but no final decision has been made. A random audit of student athletic aid packages is one possibility. That would occur in conjunction with the annual federal financial aid audit process that already takes place on the campus.

I don't want to go into a discussion of this because that's not what we're voting on, but I did want to share with the group that at my institution this past summer, we experimented with this concept by asking our external auditors to use this process to check our financial aid office and to check our student-athlete aid packages. It worked very well. It seemed to work smoothly. Auditors understood what was going on, and it was a minimal cost factor to our institution.

As I say, that's not really the issue. The issue is to approve the process of developing a compliance system and to seek, all of our input on this process over the next six months. The committee needs this additional time to work out the details related to the process. The June 1 deadline and the resolution sets a firm date for the committee to conclude that process and creates ample opportunity for feedback and input into the process over the next six months. The resolution will also ensure that once those details are resolved, the membership has an opportunity to review and approve whatever legislation is necessary to implement the audit, or whatever system is approved or proposed for the audit system, and the compliance process at next year's Convention. I urge you to support this resolution.

tion.

**Stan Caine** (Adrian College): I think we all understand that simplifying our financial aid legislation will not accomplish a lot in the long run if we fail to establish accountability in our financial aid process.

After three years of study by the Financial Aid and Awards Committee and many more years of dialogue by our membership, it's clear that a compliance and enforcement process is necessary if we are to ensure integrity in the way in which we award financial aid to our student-athletes. This resolution is a very positive step in that direction. It permits the committee and the structure to develop and finalize details in the new compliance and enforcement process over the next six months. It also ensures that the membership will have an opportunity to approve the legislation necessary to implement that process at next year's Convention. This resolution is a positive step. I encourage your support on behalf of the Presidents and the Management Councils. Thank you.

[Proposal 46-2 was adopted, 340-4-0.]

**Mr. Johnson:** We are now back to discussion on Proposal 46 as amended by 46-1 and 46-2. Is there other discussion? Seeing no one at the microphone, we're now ready to vote on Proposal No. 46 as amended by 46-1 and 46-2.

**Dick Kaiser** (Defiance College): There seems to be some problems in the back of the room with the votes not being counted. Could you wait for just a second?

**Mr. Johnson:** Are there any delegates who once you cast your vote, your light does not go out? Raise your hand if that's the case. We do have a few. Could you please come forward to the voting technicians so they can try to figure out what the problem is? It wouldn't be a Convention if we didn't have voting units that didn't work. But we're getting better. Some of you might remember last year we had people standing on tables with their antennas raised high. Other people were going around in a circle trying to find the right frequency. We only have a few people coming forward. That's not a bad result.

While we are waiting for some adjustments to be made in the system, we do have someone at a microphone to speak on 46 as amended by 46-1 and 46-2.

**Michael Gentile** (Empire Eight Conference): This morning, we had a speaker address one of the amateurism issues and make a comment that perhaps some of the resolutions had an unintended effect with respect to student-athletes. There are those among us who think that perhaps Proposal No. 46 may have an unintended effect on prospective nonstudent-athletes. Notwithstanding the protesting you may have heard this morning, if the intent of the legislation hasn't changed, the language surely has. But we agree that a process must be designed to address the problems of mistrust inherent with the awards of circumstance, and Proposition 46 negatively affects the access of educational opportunities for many high-school students.



If we are to make such awards in a manner consistent for athletes and nonathletes alike, athletics participation would need to be removed from the application processes entirely. The result would be that high-school student-athletes with no intention to participate in college athletics — and there are many — but have chosen high school athletics participation as a viable educational and leadership experience, could be denied such funding and thus possibly prevent them from attending the institutions of their choice. Thank you.

**Greg Fredricks** (Lewis and Clark College): As a point of information, on Page 64, “C” is called “Elements of Financial Aid,” and 15.2.1 is unchanged. That’s tuition and fees. Bylaw 15.2.2 in my Notice italicized, “Room and Board.” I wonder if that was meant to be deleted. Also, 15.2.3, “Books,” on Page 67, is italicized. I wonder if that was meant to be deleted, because the next is 15.2.4, which is “Government Grants,” and the number is unchanged. I don’t know if you can clarify.

**Mr. Johnson:** Mr. Martin in the legislative services staff will respond.

**Chris Martin** (NCAA Staff): To address your question, the first two points, 15.2.2 and 15.2.3 were parts of Divisions I and II legislation, which is why they have the current numbers. Bylaw 15.2.4, which you asked about, was unchanged. Any editorial changes, such as a number change in this case, would be taken care of by the Interpretations and Legislation Committee at their next meeting when they incorporate the proposals into the Manual itself. So 15.2.4, while it says unchanged in here, there may be an editorial number change.

**Mr. Johnson:** I’ve been informed that there was a slight problem with wiring but that’s been corrected. We are now ready to vote on Proposal No. 46 as amended by 46-1 and 46-2. The polls are now open. Please cast your vote.

[Proposal No. 46 was adopted as amended, 318-26-1.]

### **Eligibility — Minimum Amount of Participation**

**Ken Jones** (St. John’s University, Minnesota): I move legislative Proposal No. 47 on behalf of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

[The motion was seconded.]

Those of you who were at the Honors Dinner last night no doubt remember Secretary Cohen’s anecdote about scoring 43 points in a basketball game, only to remember his father’s rather deflating comment that it was too bad that he missed two free throws; he would have had 45 otherwise. For those of you who weren’t there, the point was not being satisfied with anything short of ideal, anything short of the best you can be. We feel that this legislation reflects Senator Cohen’s message. This fundamental Division III approach is good, but we believe that this legislation would bring our practice more in line with the ideal expressed in our philosophy.

Just to clarify before I go any further, our intent at using the words regular season was to include all traditional and nontraditional segments, and we have received an interpretation that supports that view. We all talk about the people we're serving as student-athletes. The order of those words, student-athlete, is significant. Division III is not about using the subterfuge of college enrollment to permit people to play sports. Instead, the Division III goal is to provide students with an excellent athletic experience that extends and enriches their educational opportunity beyond what they receive in the classroom.

We believe that the current rule on redshirting is contrary to this philosophy. By allowing students to practice for an entire season without counting it against their eligibility, we encourage them to manipulate their course load and to delay normal progress toward graduation. Proposal No. 47 would reverse this situation and reemphasize the priority order implicit in the phrase student-athlete.

**Tom Courtice** (Ohio Wesleyan University): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council and my own North Coast Athletic Conference, I urge Convention support for Proposal No. 47.

Delaying normal progress toward the degree for the purpose of athletics participation is simply unacceptable in Division III. The practice of redshirting, although not specifically addressed in those terms within the NCAA Manual, should not have a place in Division III. Any athletic-related action that intentionally delays a student-athlete's progress toward completion of their academic studies should not be permitted. While the practice of redshirting currently exists in all three divisions, it is inconsistent with our Division III philosophy. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge the adoption of Proposal No. 47.

**David Markee** (University of Wisconsin, Platteville): I'm representing the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Association Conference. Although the legislation in Proposal No. 47 is well intended, we believe 47 is not in the best interest of the student-athlete, thus my comments are made in opposition to 47.

Some facts about our students today. It takes on average 4.7 years according to the National Center for Educational Statistics for a student to complete a degree today. Secondly, our student-athletes generally outperform academically the overall student body. Third, many of our institutions represent very diverse student bodies to very different student needs, such as work obligations, family needs, age and academic work load. Fourth, many of us have a primary goal today of reducing the pressures on the first year of attendance, which directly reflects on our retention and graduation rates. Finally, our student-athletes as a group take no longer today than nonstudent-athletes to complete their degrees.

With all of those comments as background, I'd share with you an example of our institution. Half of our students who attend the institution are engineers. About 80 percent of our students are in tech-

nology-oriented fields and in general have a very high ACT profile. In general, these students average five years to complete the degree. We encourage those students to consider whether they want to compete and let that be a student choice.

In closing, considering our present rules, based on the information we know today about our students, we would be better to address student needs by strongly opposing 47. (Applause.)

**Paul Hoseth** (Pacific Lutheran University): I appreciate my colleagues and in many cases friends from Minnesota who have chosen to abide by this proposal, but I believe it is not a good idea for everyone. I disagree with the comments it is purely an athletically focused act contrary to the philosophy of Division III.

At our institution, we have approximately 3,000 students. About 600 freshmen enter each year along with 250-plus transfer students. Sixty-five percent of those 600 entering freshmen graduate in six years; 61 percent graduate in five years; 41 to 42 percent graduate in four years. My fuzzy math suggests that that's about 140-plus students out of 390 freshmen who do not graduate in four years. Some academic programs are not possible at our institution to finish in four years. I suspect that is true in others. Some are double majoring. Some don't know what they want to do.

Our daughter was very different. She graduated from high school and knew exactly what she wanted to do. She wanted to teach, coach and play basketball and she wanted to get a master's degree. She went out for basketball as a freshman, chose not to or was asked not to compete as a freshman. She completed her competition as a graduate student.

Another point. If I lived in Minneapolis, I could easily create a good competitive experience for freshmen in a JV program. Some of us do not live in areas where we can have good JV programs or it is financially unfeasible to do such a thing.

If we're concerned about normal progress, it's strange to me that we would make an exception for medical hardship. I know a few individuals who, with medical hardship, have impacted on their normal progress academically, yet this is part of the proposal.

Finally, in our statement of philosophy, we have some words that I think are a bit contradictory but important. We find ourselves in a situation where we're trying to meet the needs as best we can, and I heard the term "level the playing field" used. I'm not sure that's possible for all of us. We've got different endowments, we've got different tuition costs, we've got different facilities, locations and a variety of other things. For us to do that, it seems impossible. Yet today, for many of the proposals, I see something called institutional control as part of the rationale in our philosophy statement. The purpose of the NCAA is to assist its members in developing the basis of consistent and equitable competition while minimizing the infringement of the freedom of individual institutions to determine their own special objectives and programs.

I would encourage you to consider this a proposal that is not in the best interest of all institutions in Division III.

**Tim Gleason** (Ohio Athletic Conference): I'm requesting a point of clarification. We allow nontraditional practice in the fall but not competition for baseball and softball. If a student-athlete practices throughout the fall and then for whatever reason is not part of the team in the spring, would that student utilize a season of eligibility under this proposal?

**Mr. Johnson:** Could we possibly have the sponsors clarify their intent?

**Carlyle Carter** (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): As long as the individual did not practice beyond the first contest, then no season of eligibility would be used. In a nontraditional season, if you did not have competition, then that would not affect the eligibility of the student-athlete.

**Michael Miranda** (Plattsburgh State University of New York): I serve as the vice-president of Division III for FARA and we have voted to support this legislation. We view this as a proposal that would eliminate practicing against the wishes of the coaches over the academic program of the student-athlete by, in some cases, requiring a student to extend his or her academic career beyond that which would otherwise be necessary. This practice is impeditive to the philosophy and opinion of Division III, which considers student-athletes to be students first. As such, student-athletes should be able to pursue their course of study. We are in support of the proposal. Thank you.

**Heather Gilmour** (University of Southern Maine): The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee opposes the adoption of Proposal No. 47. We feel that contrary to the rationale, redshirting is not purely an athletically focused act. The decision to remain in college for more than four years is the student-athlete's decision and financial responsibility.

Circumstances may occur that warrant a fifth year and can vary for each individual. Division III student-athletes should have the opportunity to maximize their total educational experience within the legislative 10 semesters or 15 quarters.

It is a false assumption that all students graduate in four years. Many academic programs require more than four years to complete a degree. Normal progress is different for each individual. The current legislation does not extend a student-athlete's years of competition, but it does treat student-athletes as students first, enabling them to maximize their entire educational experience.

The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to defeat Proposal No. 47. Thank you. (Applause.)

**David Jacobs** (Whittier College): In deference to our good neighbors in Minnesota, I strongly oppose this proposal. I think the rationale as stated, that if a youngster participates in an entire season but does not step over the line onto the field, maybe that person should

be charged or has that experience for a year. That is not what the legislation says. It says after the first contest.

All of us who deal with compliance know of many, many cases of the person who may practice up to that first competition date, go over that date into the next week, and for many reasons in Division III — have medical problems, unrelated hardship, family, work, couldn't make the team, changed their mind, academic problems — just dropped out. They did not participate in a practice session the whole season, just after that first competition date.

I think it would be a compliance nightmare in that it also applies to new students who have been at a previous two-year or four-year institution of trying to get transfer data on game participation, documentation, film, score books or whatever. But trying to get documentation from a previous school or junior college or other about practice before the first game I think would be a nightmare.

Also, there's the person who may not, because of the rules in the junior college, practice a whole season or play another whole season, have used up three years of eligibility. I think in the world of trying to have student-athlete welfare and options with student-athletes in mind, that this would not get to what they're trying to get to. In essence, I would say if we really were serious about this, turn the 10-semester into an eight-semester rule and everybody goes for just four years. I strongly oppose this proposal.

**Dick Kaiser** (Defiance College): One of the biggest issues facing institutions of the small college variety, which Defiance College is, is retention. One of the biggest things we try to use in our colleges is involvement in the institution. Oftentimes, they're not ready to take on a lot of things, but as long as they're involved and being active within the student body and related activities, they will stay in school.

As I read this legislation, it allows an individual to participate and practice up until we play our first nontraditional contest in baseball and then quit if they don't want to use a year of eligibility. Because that goes against outside competition, we might keep them there the first semester. But for the second semester, because they've already played one game and practiced up to their first game, they couldn't come out for the team and therefore we've got a chance of losing that. Our biggest opportunity to keep the students and keep our enrollments and keep our doors open are to retain our students.

I think this is bad legislation. I agree with the young lady. Let the students make this decision. It's their money.

**David Currey** (Chapman University): I also rise to oppose this proposal. I would like to remind the body that we worked so hard to acquire a broad-based program in all of our programs. Limiting the participation of student-athletes by eliminating redshirting would be somewhat of a destruction, especially in our women's areas, because we worked through the years to build up these squad sizes. Some of our young freshmen coming into college aren't real patient because

they've been high-school stars. Sometimes if they don't play right away, they get disenchanted and want to leave the sport. By allowing them the opportunity to, as some of us say, save face and redshirt and sit out a year to get their feet on the ground, provides them a better opportunity to continue.

I'm somewhat in a dilemma of the voting because the Presidents Council says to support it. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee says not to support it. I called my president and he said listen to the students.

**Carlyle Carter** (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Association): I'm the executive director of the sponsoring group, the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. The term redshirting, which isn't in the NCAA Manual, is a misnomer. Redshirting is for one reason only — the athletic development of the student. It has nothing to do with their academic pursuits. We're not proposing to eliminate any years of eligibility. The NCAA allows for students to participate and compete for four years. We're not proposing to eliminate that. The proposal is to abolish the practice of athletically developing students, delaying their graduation and allowing them to participate for five years. If you look at the Manual, participation is defined as practice and competition.

**Shawn Eichorst** (University of Wisconsin, Whitewater): I would just like to point out a contradictory message that I heard today. This morning we talked about amateurism and we were looking at crafting legislation that would not discourage prospective student-athletes from attending our institutions. But by the same token, this afternoon we're potentially talking about proposed legislation that may discourage or take away a student-athlete's opportunity for educational pursuit. I think we all believe that athletics is part of the educational process. Again, I would refer to the students and allow them to choose.

If academics aren't really the heart of the matter, which some of us would tend to believe, if competitive disadvantage is at the heart of the matter, which I think it is, then I guess I would suggest that you show us information or data that would support that the institutions in this division are using the student-athletes to gain competitive advantage by delaying their academic pursuits. I just don't believe that's happening. It's certainly not happening at our institution. No one has ever called anyone in our conference with respect to the data of how many seniors we have on our teams.

So I think this argument on the academic pursuits falls on its face and it's quite clear to me that the students should choose. Much like last year at the Convention in San Diego where we were talking about the nontraditional segments, the students spoke to us quite loudly and clearly about their interest. I would suggest that we start thinking about our students' interest and stop restricting their ability to compete athletically, because I think they truly believe it is one of the most important educational processes they go through at our

institutions.

**Gary Karner** (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the WIAC, I encourage the membership to reject Proposal No. 47. While supporters of this legislation contend that for many student-athletes who participate in athletics for a fifth year is contrary to the philosophy of Division III, I want to remind you that philosophy is somewhat like statistics in politics. You can often successfully defend two distinctly opposite viewpoints using the same data or information. Is it not also the philosophy of Division III, and I quote, "to encourage participation, to maximize the number and variety of athletic opportunities, to support student-athletes in their efforts to reach high levels of athletics participation."

As some people have echoed here earlier, is this really about philosophy? Is it really about academic integrity? We've already seen some statistics that would suggest that for a great many of our institutions, the five-year degree is really the norm. Or is this about a perceived competitive advantage?

I'd also like to alert you to the fact that there may be some very unintended yet undesirable and unresolved issues related to this piece of legislation. For example, are we going to consider exceptions? Are we going to look at extraordinary circumstances? If so, is that going to further burden the process and relate to many waivers on this particular piece of legislation?

Secondly, and someone alluded to this earlier and this is a great concern, are we going to see a proliferation of subvarsity teams? I can speak for the WIAC that we have very few subvarsity opportunities in our conference. But when you see legislation like this, if this passes, I can see a great demand, not just at our conference but in other conferences, to provide subvarsity teams if they're going to be charged with a season of eligibility for merely practicing. There's going to be a compelling reason for individuals to look at subvarsity competition, whether it be JV or freshman, and that in turn results in more missed class time and also additional costs.

Some people mentioned earlier about the medical hardship, and I would echo that as well. Why is it that a medical hardship, even though we all have compassion in that particular case, would be exempted? Does that somehow dismiss the fact that the student received a season-ending injury and all of a sudden dismiss the academic concerns that I heard here stated by the proponents?

One other thing that I do want to add relative to some concerns is the fact that it seems to me that if we truly believe that athletics is an integral part of the educational system, why would we deny student-athletes an opportunity to participate in that last year that they're in school when they are probably more capable at that particular time to meet the rigors of participation physically, emotionally and academically than ever before? It just doesn't seem to make a lot of sense to me. I urge the membership to reject Proposal No. 47. Thank you.

**Marcelle Roberson** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Springfield College): With the occurrence of redshirting being viewed as an athletically focused event, I tend to disagree on a personal level. Due to an academic work load, I chose this year to redshirt. The decision was strictly academically based. Realizing that my program of study would take me five years to complete, I wanted to utilize this year, the year that was my toughest course load, to direct most of my focus and energies. However, I appreciate the fact that I am still participating and not losing a year of working on my skills.

The decision of a student-athlete to decide on how to manage and maximize their collegiate experience is their own choice, so we strongly urge you to defeat Proposal No. 47. Thank you.

**Mr. Johnson:** Not to discourage additional debate, but are there new ideas and thought on the issue?

**Gus Weir** (Barton College): I have a question for a point of clarification. The gentleman behind me said if there's no contests in the fall and a baseball player doesn't play in the spring, he doesn't use a season of eligibility. In the situation of a fall sport that has a nontraditional season in the spring, if the person doesn't play in the fall but plays in the spring and there are no contests in that nontraditional season but because the first regular-season game was played in the fall, does that person lose a season of eligibility? That's what it sounds like.

**Lynn Holzman** (NCAA Staff): To answer your question, if you have a sport in which the traditional segment occurs in the fall or nontraditional segment in the spring, yes, that student-athlete would use a season of competition. So in a sense, the proposal may favor sports in which your nontraditional segment is in the fall.

**Mr. Weir:** Doesn't that create unfair opportunities for athletes who participate in spring sports as opposed to fall sports?

**Mr. Johnson:** That may or may not be the case, but that's not specifically related to the proposal that's on the floor.

**Annette Shapiro** (Nazareth College): I feel strongly that we should allow people who are doing their student teaching and are discouraged from the education department not to participate in athletics to be affected by this proposal. Also, people are going abroad. I very often encourage my students to go abroad for a semester. This also is a very discouraging thing. Thank you.

**Unidentified Delegate:** I move that the question be called. (Applause.)

**Mr. Johnson** (North Central College): As long as there are no objections to the calling of the question, we can go ahead and vote on the proposal that's on the floor. Seeing no objections, we are ready to vote.

[Proposal No. 47 was defeated, 115-237-4.]



## **Playing and Practice Seasons — Practice and Competition in the Nontraditional Segment**

**Joanne Merrill** (Rivier College): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

The members of the Great Northeast Athletic Conference urge your support of Proposal No. 48. This proposal places restrictions that enhance the nontraditional ideal by limiting practice time to two days per week and competition to one weekend day for a four-week period. We believe this is sufficient time within a nontraditional segment to prepare and evaluate student-athletes. This proposal is a move in a positive direction to reduce the demands of student-athletes, coaches, athletic trainers and institutions with limited resources. Thank you.

**Jim Nelson** (Suffolk University): This morning, I had the opportunity to preview my remarks relative to my stance on this proposal. Let me capsule it without going through my entire thoughts this afternoon.

Last year in San Diego when the vote first came up, it did pass 158 to 155, with five abstentions, to eliminate competition in the nontraditional season. When we returned for the afternoon session, we decided that we would change our thoughts on that and further debate it. A number of individuals certainly were concerned that practice opportunities were not a part of that legislation. Let me again indicate that this initially passed and there's a strong feeling within this room that there should be no competition at all. But there was an equal amount in terms of support that there be competition. Our student-athletes have indicated that they would welcome student-athlete participation in the nontraditional season. But there was a significant concern about the unlimited number of practice opportunities. Proposal No. 48 will address that central concern for many of us regarding the nontraditional season, that being practice opportunities. As mentioned this morning, the impact of practice in the nontraditional season can be as significant as in the traditional season, with those tentacles being pervasive in the areas of trainers, training room facilities and athletic trainers, field or court scheduling and maintenance, as well as coaching staff priorities and time demands. The two practice opportunities and one weekend daily competition will allow for evaluation and skill advancement while minimizing missed class opportunities, a concern of all, particularly in the nontraditional season.

Whatever the title imposed, whether it be coach's or captain's practice, we as the scheduling administrators have the ability and responsibility to place any parameters we deem appropriate, from assigning a trainer to requiring a coach, assistant coach, or an athletic administrator to be in attendance at all sessions, whether it be practice or competition.

Adoption of Proposal 48 moves us forward from what was a somewhat contentious argument last year battling against elimination of competition. We, as advocates, as responsible caretakers, can feel good that we have addressed a common ground for both practice and competition. Thank you.

**Susan Bassett** (William Smith College): I'm a member of the Management Council. The Management Council recommends that this proposal be defeated. Its three main concerns are noted on Page 77 of the Convention Notice. First, the proposal does not address the special needs of various individual team sports, especially those sports like golf, tennis and rowing when schools must schedule a majority of their contests in the nontraditional segment for geographic reasons.

Second, the limit of two practices per week may not permit sufficient conditioning for permissible weekend competition. This is a significant health and safety concern.

Third, the proposal seems to legitimize captain's practices. Captain's practices are not defined in the NCAA Manual and are subject to interpretation. Further, holding such practices without proper supervision and support suggests serious liability concerns. While a consensus may exist supporting additional limits to the nontraditional segment, this proposal does not present the best approach. Rather, Proposals 49 and 50 are more preferable. Thank you.

**Dan DiBiasio** (Wilmington College, Ohio): I'm a member of the Presidents Council. I, too, would like to speak in opposition to this proposal for many of the same reasons cited by the Management Council. However, two stand out for us. First, while the Council supports further limits to the nontraditional playing and practice segments, this proposal attempts to treat all sports in a similar fashion.

As we heard repeatedly during last year's Convention, significant differences exist between team sports and individual sports like golf, tennis and rowing. Individual sports have unique needs and characteristics that will require unique solutions to be successful. Treating team and individual sports in the same way will be problematic.

Second, the legislation referenced in captain's practices is also troubling to us. Liability concerns and the principle of institutional control strongly suggests that we should not adopt a proposal that would legitimize captain's practices in any way.

In summary, the Presidents Council believes the legislation is well intended but has serious flaws. Therefore, we believe this proposal should be defeated. Thank you.

**Christopher Wright** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/State University College at New Paltz): The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee opposes the adoption of Proposal No. 48.

There are liability ramifications involved with captain's practices due to the lack of supervision by coaches and athletic trainers. The time restraints imposed by this proposal would severely limit the amount of developmental time in the nontraditional season, and two

practices are not enough time to properly prepare for nontraditional contests.

The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to defeat Proposal No. 48. Thank you.

**Scott Carnahan** (Linfield College): I recently returned from Nashville where the Division III baseball coaches met. Over 300 baseball coaches took a straw vote on Proposals 48, 49 and 50. There was a unanimous vote for number 50 by the baseball coaches, feeling it was the fairest of all three.

[Proposal No. 48 was defeated, 34-332-0.]

### **Maximum Dates of Competition – Baseball and Softball**

**Suzanne Coffey** (Bates College): On behalf of the NCAA Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee and the Presidents Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will eliminate the current tournament dates legislation that permits an institution to count each date of the tournament as one contest, regardless of the number of contests played on that date. This proposal also increases to 40 the number of contests that may be played during the traditional segment and reduces the number of contests to five that may be played during the nontraditional segment. The original number of contests, 45, remains the same.

While the maximum number of contests in many sports is 45, the committee, in reviewing the teams selected and the respective NCAA championships, confirmed that many schools were playing far more than 45 contests. In fact, many schools were playing somewhere between 50 and 55 contests. The committee questions the effectiveness of the current legislative limit. The proposal legitimizes this limit of 45 by eliminating the two-for-one tournament dates legislation. For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal. Thank you.

**Al Bean** (University of Southern Maine): I'm a member of the Management Council. This proposal will emphasize the legislative limit of 45 games in the sports of baseball and softball by eliminating the current tournament dates legislation. By adopting this proposal, schools will no longer be able to play two and sometimes three games each day of a tournament and only be charged with one game. This practice permits schools to play more games than the legislative limit of 45. The limit of 45 is realistic and should be more firmly applied. I urge your support of this proposal.

**Bette Landman** (Beaver College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, I speak in support of Proposal 49.

The Interpretations and Legislation Committee closely examined the overall number of baseball and softball games played during the 2000 season. On average, each school played 40 to 42 contests, excluding the current contest exemptions. This proposal will make

the legislation consistent with the initial average.

Institutions will still be able to utilize the current contest exemptions, such as the conference championship and alumni game exemptions. Institutions, however, will no longer be able to play upwards of 55 or 60 games if this proposal is adopted. This will eliminate excessive playing schedules and create a better balance between athletics and academics for all baseball and softball student-athletes.

I urge you to support this proposal, and I thank you.

**Donna Ledwin** (New Jersey Athletic Conference): In considering this proposal to eliminate tournament exemptions for baseball and softball, at Saturday's Division III business administrators meeting, they asked for the rationale behind why tournament exemptions were allowed in the first place. Before we take them away, perhaps we should look at the reason they came into being and hopefully, that is a good reason.

I was told that there were two reasons. The first was to provide some relief for schools in the Northeast and Midwest during the spring season when a snowstorm or heavy rain can wipe out a week's worth of games, which are extremely difficult to make up in that short amount of time. By having the tournament exemption, you can travel to warmer states during spring break and have the opportunity to reach your limit — not exceed the limit but reach the limit.

The other was that with those tournaments in place, it was very difficult to know how many games you were going to play in the course of the season and know how many games you can schedule. But it was designed to limit the total number of games played toward your limit if you didn't know how successful you would be during the course of the tournament. Were you going to be knocked out the first round or make it all the way to the end? You didn't have a handle on how many games you'd play. That's the reason I was told.

It also came out in the discussion that the reason for wanting to eliminate them was because the exemptions were being abused, people were playing too many games. I didn't see that in the rationale anywhere. I guess that bothered us. It just became apparent that the good intentions of this legislation have been subverted by a few schools. I don't know the numbers. How many schools are actually abusing this? I can tell you in the New Jersey Athletic Conference in both baseball and softball, we are among the most competitive conferences in the nation in both of those sports. Last season, only one softball program and only one baseball program, when you counted individual games, exceeded the 36-game limit. Those programs had 39 games each. I don't know exactly who's abusing it, but it isn't us. We need those tournaments to complete a full schedule in the course of the season because of our weather conditions.

It would seem to me that there's a sensible intermediate step before you totally eliminate the tournament exemptions. One step might be to draft a definition of a tournament. There does not currently exist a definition of tournament in the Division III Manual.

Perhaps that is why this is being abused. But rather than throw out the tournament exemptions altogether, perhaps that's what can happen as an intermediate step. I would suggest that if you look at Proposal No. 50, it eliminates one of the tournaments exemptions. We think that's a more prudent option.

At this time, I would like to make a motion to refer Proposal 49 back to the Playing and Practice Subcommittee to consider crafting a definition of tournament so these abuses don't continue and allow exemptions to do the good things that they are supposed to be doing, which was part of the intent of the original legislation. Thank you.

[The motion to refer Proposal 49 was seconded then defeated, 140-212-3.]

**Mike Mould** (College of Misericordia): I have a concern with the five contests in the nontraditional segment. This tends to reduce in many institutions the number of nontraditional contests that are being played. Are we going to find ourselves as administrators fielding a statement from a coach that indicates that they're going to play an institution in a 14-inning nontraditional sophomore game? Is that okay to do? We say it's against the spirit of the rules, so we would prefer or suggest or demand that you not do that. They're rejoinder is, well, "X" institution is doing it, "Y" institution is doing it, and we're now at a disadvantage. This is a real potential problem that we have to deal with as administrators. Thank you.

**Rick Simon** (University of La Verne): I guess this is an interpretation question. The only place that I can see the reference to the limitation to five nontraditional contests is in the intent and rationale. I don't see that in the legislation. I think the assumption is being made that raising the limit to 40 for the traditional season means that every institution will play 40. That effectively would limit it to five in the nontraditional season. But if they don't play 40, they could still play more than five nontraditional dates.

**Chris Martin** (NCAA Staff): It is correct that you could play more than five games in the nontraditional segment, provided you don't exceed the total number of contests with 45 or 40 overall contests in the traditional segment.

[Proposal No. 49 was adopted, 182-167-5.]

### **Playing and Practice Seasons – Nontraditional Segment – Baseball, Field Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer, Softball and Women's Volleyball**

**Donna Ledwin** (New Jersey Athletic Conference): On behalf of the New Jersey Athletic Conference, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

In reviewing the proceedings of last year's Convention on the issue of practice and competition during the nontraditional segment, it was clear to us that reasonable people can disagree. Division III is an incredibly diverse body of institutions, each with varying

resources and objectives. While there is no one-size-fits-all solution, there are steps we can take to move toward more common ground on this issue. Proposal No. 50 is a solution that addresses the concerns of both the presidents and the student-athletes and accommodates the broad range of approaches to the Division III philosophy practiced by the membership. We believe Proposal No. 50 is a prudent step in the right direction and we urge your support.

**Ron Applbaum** (Kean University): I'm a member of the Presidents Council. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I encourage the delegates to support Proposal 50. The Presidents Council believes this proposal represents a good-faith attempt to establish reasonable limits on competition in the nontraditional segment that we all can live with. It targets the team sports that appear to have the greatest need for reduction and sets reasonable contest and playing-season limits in those sports.

It is important to note that the proposal also prohibits missed class time for competition in the nontraditional segment. That provision is very significant and should not be overlooked. The Presidents Council recognizes that many delegates would like to go further, perhaps much further, in limiting the nontraditional segment. However, the Presidents Council believes this proposal represents legislation that a majority of the Division III membership can and should support. The Presidents Council urges you to pass Proposal 50. Thank you.

**Al Bean** (University of Southern Maine): During the past two years, I served as chair of the Management Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons. In that time period, the subcommittee reviewed many different proposals designed to contain competition in the nontraditional segment. To be honest, the subcommittee rarely was able to agree on a proposal to support. As a representative body of the membership as a whole, the subcommittee often had significant differences of opinion on the nontraditional segment proposals. This will come as no surprise to those of you who recall our discussion and votes on last year's nontraditional legislation.

Proposal 50 is one of the very few proposals that earns the support of the clear majority of the subcommittee and the full Management Council. But that matter may be the only proposal to receive that level of support. The proposal targets the team sports that are of greatest concern. It also sets reasonable limits on missed class time, segment length and the number of contests that may occur during the nontraditional segment. This proposal will certainly not please everyone, but the Management Council believes it is a reasonable compromise that is both practical and consistent with our philosophy.

**Kary Couchman** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Albion College): The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports the adoption of Proposal No. 50. At the 2000 NCAA Convention, this committee stood in opposition to the elimination of competition

during the nontraditional season. We feel that this proposal is a good compromise. It addresses the concerns raised last year by the Division III membership while maintaining the importance of competition. In addition, the limitations placed on the listed sports maintain the nontraditional season as an integral part of the total educational experience while allowing student-athletes the ability to reap the benefits of both competition and practice.

The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 50.

**Jim Nelson** (Suffolk University): First, let me thank those 33 others who supported me on Proposal No. 48. I'll be taking them to dinner later this evening. It won't have much of an impact on my wallet.

I do appreciate the comments of the members of the Presidents Council who indicated Proposal No. 48 was well intentioned. I also know that in our conversation last year in San Diego, that there was a great deal of concern about the unlimited number of practice opportunities that may occur. It is a little bit difficult for me to speak against Proposal 50 without giving the feeling that I'm involved in sour grapes. Obviously, I am not because their proposal also was well intentioned, although it does not address what I indicated — the belief that was a central tenet in controlling the number of practice opportunities.

Last year, with all that conversation, we may have the feeling that we're being worn down and let's get something passed relative to nontraditional seasons. I would indicate that if we do pass this, we have not heard by any means the last of our angst relative to what goes on in our campus relative to nontraditional seasons because of unfair practice opportunities. After all of that conversation last year, I'd like to see those individuals who shared my concern with the practice opportunities to also walk the talk. Thank you very much.

**Dick Kaiser** (Defiance College): I think it's important that everyone understand that you are not voting on baseball and softball anymore. You are only voting on those that are listed. We lost the opportunity to vote on baseball and softball when we voted 49 in.

**Mr. Johnson:** Thank you, Dick. I was just going to remind everyone to look at your mootnicity sheet. Under Proposal 49, it indicates what is now moot in 50 and what remains.

**Ed Streb** (Rowan University): I rise to ask for clarification on Number 49 in the mootnicity that you're referring to. If you read the intent of 49, it was to limit to five the number of baseball contests, for example, in the nontraditional segment. Since that was the intent of that legislation, I wonder if you can clarify how Section C is rendered moot in Proposal 50.

Your clarification earlier was that by passing 49, one would not be limited to five baseball contests in the nontraditional segment. That's the wording of that particular legislation. But in the intent, it's worded otherwise.

**Chris Martin** (NCAA Staff): The intent of the proposal is to limit the total number of contests to 45. If you played five contests in the nontraditional segment, you can't play more than 40 in the traditional segment. On the other side, if you played nine in the nontraditional segment, you can only play 36 in the traditional segment because you are staying below your maximum number of 45. So the way the intent is written would indicate that an institution that plays the five in the nontraditional segment can only have 40 in the traditional segment.

**Mr. Streb:** But the intent of 49 was to limit it to five in the nontraditional. I'm just trying to clarify this. Your interpretation of 49 was apparently correct if you look at the proposal. If you look at the intent of the proposal, it's not exactly the same. The intent of 49 was to limit to five the number of baseball games in the nontraditional segment. That may not be the way it's worded, but that was the intention, according to what's on Page 77. The intention of Number 50 is also to limit to five the number of baseball contests in the nontraditional season. I don't understand how the passage of 49 renders 50 moot in that area.

**Mr. Johnson:** Give us a moment. We will figure this out.

**Bette Landman** (Beaver College): It does seem to me, however, that while the intent language is at odds with the language of the bylaws, we passed the bylaws. We did so with the full knowledge after the question was asked and clarified on the floor before the vote, that in fact we were not limiting the language to five nontraditional games. I agree with you there is a disconnect between the language of the intent and the language of the bylaws itself. But it seems to me what we pass in this body are the bylaws and bylaw language, and it's not as if we did so without knowing clarification of that point.

**Mr. Streb:** Absolutely. But what I'm trying to clarify here at this point is that should not render Section C of 50 moot. You were rendering it moot based on an incorrect interpretation of 49; C and G as well — softball as well as the baseball.

**John Biddiscombe** (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): Not to further complicate this, but if it's in fact just an interpretation about whether "C" is moot or not, if the interpretation were to be revised to make letter C stand, then in fact what was trying to be accomplished in 49 could be accomplished. In fact, those voting with C included could accomplish having the 40 plus five stand as part of the legislation.

**Mr. Johnson:** The chair, I believe in this particular case, has the prerogative to rule on the intent of the interpretation here. The ruling is 50-C and G will stand. They are not moot. They will stand.

**Shawn Eichorst** (University of Wisconsin, Whitewater): Regarding order of parliamentary procedure. With respect to what happened earlier, I'm still a little bit confused with respect to how the passage of proposed legislation can render future legislation moot before you even get to it. I know we talked about it earlier, but by



simply passing 49 before you pass 50, in my opinion, you cannot declare those issues in 50 that are in contrast with 49 moot. What has to happen is there has to be amendments to the proposed legislation to deal with the contrast in those issues.

For instance, in the baseball issue, with the counting of tournaments, it's different in 49 compared to 50. You can't declare, I believe, 50-D or E or whatever is moot just by passing 49 first. If 50 is numbered 48, it comes before 49, and just by passing that first, you declare everything following moot? That's not parliamentarily procedure on how you deal with those issues. You have contrasting legislation in Proposal 49 and 50. You can't declare everything in 50 moot just because it doesn't agree with 49 without having ever addressed it in the beginning. It has to be justified by either a friendly amendment or amendment to 49.

I know you tried to deal with that earlier, but I don't think that's the way you deal with it. You don't wrap 50 first just because you want to deal with the contrast. You have to justify them first and vote on them separately. I'm sure there was a lot of people hanging around on 49, saying I'm just going to vote on 50 because I don't think that those issues in 50 are moot just by passing 49. There's some people who have issues with both. But should they be brought together, it may bring more justification to the proposals.

That's my parliamentary point on that. I don't think the way in which we're dealing with it is the proper way to do it.

**Mr. Johnson:** Seeing that I'm not an expert on parliamentary procedure, we'll bring in a parliamentarian so these things can be dealt with.

Dan, if you would like to clarify.

**Dan Dutcher** (NCAA Staff): Thank you. This is an item that seems to come up every year. This is an item for which the NCAA has adopted special rules of order that can be found in Constitution 5.1.4.3.1 on Page 31 of your Manual.

Let me just read this quickly: "In consideration of groupings and related amendments and amendments-to-amendments, the Convention shall consider first the proposal that contemplates the greatest modification to the present circumstance, followed by the other proposals in the order of decreasing modification. Once a proposal in such a grouping is adopted, those that follow will become moot."

So I understand your point and appreciate it, but this is standard practice under NCAA Convention procedures. It's a special rule of order and that's the ruling under which the mootnicity opinions have been issued.

**Mr. Eichorst:** So in fact what you're saying is 50 has less impact than 49? Is that the ruling that's been made? Less impact for 50 than it is for 49? That's why 49 is going first?

**Mr. Dutcher:** In this case, 49 was voted on before 50 because the changes contemplated to baseball and softball as a whole were con-

sidered to be more stringent or more radical than the changes in baseball and softball that's contemplated in Proposal 50.

**Mr. Eichorst:** But doesn't 50 address other sports than just baseball and softball?

**Mr. Dutcher:** Sports other than baseball and softball are not affected by Proposal 49. That's correct.

**Mr. Eichorst:** I guess I understand the point, but it seems as though there's a lot of confusion back in our group with respect to how 49 was handled.

**Mr. Johnson:** Thank you for your comments.

**John Galaris** (Salem State College): I apologize to Chris for challenging his interpretation. But it's my understanding that as part of the legislative process, the history and the comments are made a part of the legislation. The intent in 49 is clear that it was to limit in the fall the number of contests to five. So I challenge the interpretation to the parliamentarian.

**Mr. Johnson:** In response to your comment, because of the ruling, if you pass 50, 50-C and G basically get to the intent, which is a limit of five that is present because 49 has passed.

**Mr. Galaris** (Salem State College): I understand what happens if 50 is passed. If it fails, however, the ruling on 49 now says you can play more than five games in the nontraditional season, which is clearly contrary to the intent of the legislation. So again, I challenge that ruling if 50 fails. That may have affected the vote on 49. So you may have to revote it.

**Mr. Johnson:** Seeing no one else at the microphones, we are ready to vote on 50. The polls are now open.

**Joyce Wong** (Eastern Connecticut State University): I would like to know in voting on Proposal 50, are we voting on its entirety, or are we voting on 50-A and then 50-B and then 50-C, or are we voting on everything that was not deemed moot?

**Mr. Johnson:** We are voting on 50-A, B, C, E, F, G, and J. I'll repeat. A, B, C, E, F, G and J.

[Proposal No. 50 was adopted 279-54-6.]

### **First Permissible Practice Date – Basketball**

**John Neese** (Hardin-Simmons University): On behalf of the American Southwest Conference, I would like to move for the adoption of Proposal No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will simplify and standardize the start of preseason on-court basketball practice to prevent incorrect interpretation of the current rule. Establishing a standard start date of October 15 will make the rule easier to interpret and help avoid numerous questions each year as to the actual starting date for basketball practice.

**Jeanie Watson** (Nebraska Wesleyan University): I am a member of the Presidents Council. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 51.

The possible reduction of time demands for student-athletes by combining basketball with conditioning is the primary reason members of the Presidents Council express support for the proposal. It should also be noted that the proposal does not extend the season and provides the sport of basketball with an opportunity for a 21-week playing and practice season, consistent with other Division III sports. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge the adoption of Proposal No. 51.

**Joy Reighn** (Rowan University): On behalf of the Division III Management Council and the Playing and Practice Season Subcommittee, I urge your support of Proposal No. 51.

This proposal seeks to standardize and simplify the start of pre-season on-court basketball practice by establishing a more uniform and consistent approach for practice for student-athletes. Permitting the use of equipment such as a basketball as part of the entire pre-season practice in the sport of basketball makes sense and is consistent with the treatment of all Division III sports. As an administrator, the inclusion of a ball in conditioning may reduce informal practice and resulting time demands for student-athletes. On behalf of the Management Council, I urge you to vote yes for Proposal 51.

**Linda Moulton** (Clark University, Massachusetts): I rise to speak against 51. I'm concerned that the rationale focuses on making it easier to administer because the current rule has led to incorrect interpretations and is confusing. I'm not sure I understand what's confusing about our starting date nor do I think that our basketball coaches are confused about when they can start on-court practice. If you really want to simplify the understanding, perhaps our on-court starting date should be November 1. I would like to advise the membership that our original rationale for changing the on-court practice date was to minimize overlapping seasons relative to issues affecting facilities, athletic training staff and dual-sport athletes.

While I know many of my colleagues share my gratitude that we had a year's reprieve of not seeing this legislation on the agenda, I hope that we will hold true to our original concerns about infringements on fall-season sports and will defeat this proposal.

**Jane Baldwin** (Capital University): I have a point of information. On Page 82 in the book, I assume that the clause "the fourth Saturday preceding the first permissible contest date" should be italicized?

**Mr. Johnson:** Yes.

**Ms. Baldwin:** Thank you.

**Mr. Johnson:** That particular information is in your Convention Program.

[Proposal No. 51 was adopted, 211-141-2.]

### **Contest Exemptions – Season-Ending Tournament – Basketball**

**Suzanne Coffey** (Bates College): As a member of the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee, and on behalf of the

Presidents Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit institutions to exempt contests annually played in a conference championship tournament in the sport of basketball. Current legislation requires contests played in a season-ending conference tournament in the sport of basketball to count as one contest toward the institutional maximum number of contest limitations. In all other sports, similar contests are exempt from the maximum number of contests. This proposal will apply the same standard to the sport of basketball. On behalf of the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee, I urge you to vote yes on Proposal No. 52.

**Muriel Howard** (State University College at Buffalo): Speaking on behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge you to support this proposal because it would exempt contests played in a conference championship in the sport of basketball. The Interpretations and Legislation Committee has worked quite hard over the past year to create consistent playing and practice season legislation. This proposal supports this effort. Exemptions exist for championship competition in all other sports. Simply put, this proposal is about consistency. I urge you to support it.

[Proposal No. 52 (Page A-86) was adopted, 314-40-0.]

### **First Permissible Contest Date – Football**

**Mr. Johnson:** Our next proposal is Number 53. We need to note that this is a football-only vote. Only schools that sponsor football can vote on this proposal.

**Gary Karner** (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 53.

[The motion was seconded.]

Quite simply, this proposal provides institutions the flexibility to schedule their first football game one day earlier than is currently permissible at a time when it would least impact their own particular academic calendars and travel budgets. For those institutions that are either geographically isolated from or competitively isolated by neighboring Division III institutions in the sport of football, the only options in fulfilling nonconference schedules are to play Division II opponents or to travel considerable distances.

Using the WIAC as an example, the vast majority of our nonconference football opponents for the past five years have been from Division II. Furthermore, WIAC teams have traveled as far as California, Texas, Tennessee, Nebraska, Kansas, South Dakota, Ohio and the state of Washington in search of nonconference games. Since Division II institutions are permitted to play on that Thursday, this legislation would provide institutions like the WIAC with greater possibility of scheduling Division II opponents closer to home and thereby reducing travel costs and the amount of missed class time.

Based on the remarks contained in the Official Notice, it has been suggested that this proposal would have a negative impact on academic calendars. On the contrary. Since this is permissive legislation, this legislation allows each institution to determine for itself whether it chooses to play on Thursday or Friday based on what would have the least impact on its academic calendar and travel costs.

Furthermore, since there are institutions such as ones in the WIAC that don't even begin classes before Labor Day, to suggest that this proposal would negatively impact our academic calendar doesn't make a lot of sense.

Therefore, I again urge you to adopt Proposal No. 53. Thank you.

**Tom Courtice** (Ohio Wesleyan University): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, I urge that the Convention oppose Proposal 53. While, as the speaker just said, the proposal may be permissive legislation, the Presidents Council believes it is not necessarily sound and should be opposed. The proposal could in fact extend the regular season. It could provide class conflicts for colleges that begin early, and/or for others additional practice, lodging and meal costs could be incurred by bringing students back to campus early.

Based on the Division III philosophy and the commitment to academics, the Presidents Council urges the delegates to defeat Proposal No. 53.

**Mr. Karner:** With all due respect to the Presidents Council, because this is permissive legislation, there's nothing in here that suggests you need to play on Thursday. All we're asking for is the flexibility to be able to schedule, given our particular scheduling complications and scheduling complications that others in here experience because of the competitive isolation we receive from your neighboring Division III institutions, particularly in the sport of football. All we're asking for is the flexibility to do it, to make a decision institutionally what's best for our institution relative to missed class time. Under the current situation, we often are forced because Division II schools do not want to play us on the weekend, to travel considerable distances to get games, oftentimes the following week. When you talk about missed class time and you talk about travel costs, that is a big issue for us.

I realize that this particular issue doesn't affect everyone in this room, but at the same time, I will argue that that's a good enough reason not to oppose it. If you choose not to play on Thursday, that's your prerogative. All we're asking for is the flexibility to do so for our own particular unique circumstances. Thank you.

**Karen Johnson** (Alfred University): On behalf of the Division III Management Council and the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee, I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 53. This proposal, while perhaps could be viewed as permissive legislation, would extend the football seasons for those institutions that opt to do so. For example, if a game was scheduled for the Thursday prior to Labor Day, the preparation time needed would necessitate an earlier return

to campus for student-athletes and staff, thereby extending the season.

Another issue to consider is possible financial implications with an earlier start date. Requiring student-athletes and staff to return to campus early might result in additional costs for housing and meal needs. The Management Council believes that extending the season is not sound legislation for Division III and should be opposed. Thank you.

**Mr. Karner:** I understand the point that's being made, but I also want to make sure this is clear. We're talking about one day. So even for those institutions that should elect to choose that particular option, I don't think we're talking about a considerable burden in terms of one day. I don't think it gives us any kind of competitive advantage. We'd still have the same number of practice opportunities up until the first contest. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 53 was defeated, 51-124-0.]

### **Three-Day Noncontact, Conditioning Practice Period – Football**

**Tim Gleason** (Ohio Athletic Conference): I move Proposal 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will allow those first days of practices, while still noncontact, to be a better prelude to the practices that do have contact. Wearing shoulder pads in the noncontact period is a more realistic approach when throwing and catching and general body movements and a better transition to contact practices. There is no cost involved. There is no class time or academic implications whatsoever. There is no addition to length of season. Most importantly, there is nothing to indicate a safety hazard. Our friends in other divisions have gone this route, and there are no data, to our knowledge, that indicate increased injuries. Therefore, I urge adoption of Proposal 54.

**Ron Applbaum** (Kean University): I'm a member of the Presidents Council. Speaking on behalf of the Council, this proposal seems ill advised. The use of shoulder pads will risk changing the fundamental nature of the current noncontact period. It will only serve to encourage contact. We should preserve the noncontact nature of the current conditioning period and not undermine it.

This proposal seems unnecessary. No data suggest that adding shoulder pads during the current noncontact conditioning activities will help reduce injuries. For these two reasons, the Presidents Council urges you to defeat this proposal. Thank you.

**Dewayne Barnes** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Whittier College): The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee opposes the adoption of Proposal No. 54. An integral component of our committee mission statement is to protect student-athlete welfare. We are in agreement with the Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports Committee's position that the implementation of shoulder pads during the three-day noncontact period increases the incidence of heat-related illness and the likelihood of contact

during this period. The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee believes that it is in the best interest of student-athlete welfare to maintain the current bylaw and oppose the adoption of Proposal No. 54. Thank you.

**Mike Clary** (Rhodes College): I'm the chair of the Division III Football Committee. At yesterday's Division III coaches council meeting in Atlanta at the AFCA convention, the Division III football coaches asked me to stress their commitment to teaching fundamentals in the safest possible environment.

Proposal 54 is a test of our directors of athletics' trust of good judgment of your head football coach and his staff. If you believe your head football coach currently is insensitive and irresponsible to heat acclimation and contact and will use these first three days of practice to increase contact, then you should vote against this proposal. There are numerous opportunities during preseason and regular-season practice where you must count on the professional wisdom of your football staff in collaboration with your athletic training staff in dealing with heat acclimation and contact in practice. I think you will find if you sit down with your head football coach, they're extremely interested in the welfare of their students, and not increasing contact and heat acclimation is very much in their interest. So if you trust the good judgment of your head football coach in dealing with teaching fundamentals in a safe environment, I urge you to support Proposal 54.

**Chris Walker** (University of Redlands): I'm a member of the Division III Management Council speaking on behalf of the Council. I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 54.

The Division III Management Council Playing and Practice Season Subcommittee has identified the following concerns with this proposal based on information noted by the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports.

This committee has also opposed the proposal in the past based on the following concerns: One, having student-athletes wear shoulder pads increases the likelihood of contact activities. This is inevitable. Two, NCAA injury surveillance data did not support that wearing shoulder pads in a noncontact setting reduces the risk of shoulder injury. Three, wearing shoulder pads hinders the body's ability to dissipate heat during a three-day noncontact period, which is an extremely important time to properly acclimate the body to increased temperatures.

I would also like to remind you that the delegates at the 1997 Convention voted in opposition of this proposal for the same reasons. The Management Council urges you to defeat Proposal 54. Thank you.

**Bill Klika** (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison): I'm on the Division III Football Championship Committee. On behalf of the American Football Coaches Association, I would like to lend my support for Proposal 54 in the NCAA legislation to allow the use of shoul-

der pads during the three noncontact period days of the preseason. The passage of this proposal will benefit the health, safety and teaching of fundamentals to student-athletes on this level. Grant Teaff, executive director of the American Football Coaches Association, would also like to echo what Mike Clary said about trust between administrator and coach. I'm in a unique position. I certainly do trust my football coach.

**Carlyle Carter** (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): We know that this legislation has been before the body on several occasions in the past. The subcommittee, as our colleague has already stated, opposes this proposal based on three points.

My questions are going to address each one of these points. Is it the position of the subcommittee that football coaches are not capable of abiding by NCAA policy? By stating that wearing shoulder pads during the noncontact period increases the likelihood of contact activities, aren't we indicating that our coaches are incapable of following NCAA rules? What happens at this moment if, during the noncontact period, shoulder pads are worn? It's a violation and is dealt with in that manner.

Point No. 2. Has the data collected from the injury surveillance system determined that the frequency of injuries has increased in Division I and Division II since the passage of legislation permitting the use of shoulder pads? When in contact with the injury surveillance program, I was told that there was no data available to determine if the use of shoulder pads has had a positive or negative effect.

Three, regarding the heat situation, is this not a sports medicine issue? How many of our football programs practice without a sports medicine representative present? The days of coaches keeping players away from water or taking breaks because it makes you tough has gone the same way as the adage that you don't get the break just because it makes you tough.

My son currently participates as a Division I player in a program. I viewed their practices during the first three days. Although I am not saying the resources are the same at Division I as Division III, I will say the players are encouraged to take water whenever they wish and actually water breaks are built into their schedules. Is it the contention of the subcommittee that our programs will be less concerned about student-athlete welfare for Division III? I don't think so.

Do we not think that in the use of shoulder pads during the noncontact conditioning period since the inception at the Division I and Division II level that there are data to prove that it would be detrimental to the welfare of student-athletes, that we would not have seen legislation brought to the floor and to the attention of the membership to have the practice abolished?

**Jeremy Duffy** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of Wisconsin, Platteville): The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee opposes the adoption of Proposal No. 54. Current legisla-



tion mandates a three-day noncontact period. No contact means no contact. We believe the adoption of this legislation may increase the incidental contact that may already be happening under the current bylaw. In the rationale for this legislation, it states: "Any player whomakes contact with the ground while running without shoulder pads risks injury." Yet, many other sports, such as soccer and field hockey, deal with this same risk without shoulder pads. The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly urges you to defeat Proposal No. 54. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 54 was defeated, 82-100-1.]

**Mr. Johnson:** That concludes our roll call votes for today. We can vote on the rest of the proposals using our paddles. However, keep your voting units handy because later this afternoon, if we need to reconsider any proposals numbered 46 through 54, you will need them then.

### **Division III Championships – Minimum Number of Institutions**

**Joy Reighn** (Rowan University): As a member of the Division III Management Council and Championships Committee, and on behalf of the Presidents Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

In an effort to increase NCAA championship opportunities for women in an emerging team sport, the Association's governance structure proposes that the number of sponsoring institutions required to establish a Division III championship be reduced from 40 institutions to 28 institutions. Reducing the number of institutions that must sponsor the sport in order to create a Division III championship provides more championship opportunities sooner for Division III female student-athletes. Further, if the legislation is adopted, along with Proposal No. 57, a Division III women's ice hockey championship may be established as early as 2001-02. On behalf of the Presidents Council, Management Council and Championships Committee, I urge you to vote yes for Proposal No. 55.

[Proposal No. 55 was adopted.]

### **Division III Championships – Women's Rowing**

**Susan Bassett** (William Smith College): As a member of the Division III Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

In an effort to increase NCAA championship opportunities for Division III female student-athletes, the Association's governance structure proposes the establishment of a Division III championship in women's rowing and to establish a Division III rowing committee as specified. Currently, 41 Division III members sponsor women's rowing, which meets the existing legislative requirement to establish a division-specific championship. The Women's Rowing Committee would consist of six members, one member selected from each of the

Division III women's rowing regions.

On behalf of the Presidents Council, Management Council and the Championships Committee, I urge you to vote yes on Proposal 56.

[Proposal No. 56 was adopted.]

### **Division III Championships – Women's Ice Hockey**

**Louise O'Neal** (Wellesley College): As a member of the Management Council and Championships Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Association's governance structure proposes to establish a Division III championship in women's ice hockey and a Women's Ice Hockey Committee as specified in the printed program. The Association's governance structure does this to increase NCAA championship opportunities for Division III women student-athletes. Currently, 32 Division III members sponsor women's ice hockey. Our adoption of Proposal No. 55 allows for the Division III Women's Ice Hockey Championship to be effective the next academic year. The related Women's Ice Hockey Committee will consist of six representatives. On behalf of the Presidents Council the Management Council, and the Championships Committee, I urge you to vote yes for Proposal 57.

[Proposal No. 57 was adopted.]

### **Ethical Conduct – Gambling Activities**

**Christopher Walker** (University of Redlands): As a member of the Management Council and the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 58.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will protect the foundation and stability of intercollegiate athletics by increasing the sanctions for individuals involved in gambling and sports wagering. Gambling and sports wagering continue to seriously threaten the fabric of intercollegiate athletics.

Over the past five years, the NCAA membership has significantly increased educational efforts in this area. The committee believes the student-athletes are aware that they may not engage in the following gambling activities: Provide information to individuals involved in organized gambling activity; solicit a bet on any intercollegiate team; accept a bet on any team representing the institution; or place a bet using a parlay card or grid.

This proposal is the next phase of the educational effort. Specifically, it's important that the Divisions I, II and III membership send a clear and consistent message to student-athletes and the intercollegiate athletics community that gambling and sports wagering will be dealt with in a serious manner.

This proposal significantly increases the sanctions for student-athletes who engage in gambling activities, influence the outcome of

an intercollegiate athletics contest or participate in organized gambling. The two-tiered focus would establish a significant penalty schedule for individuals involved in gambling and attempting to influence the outcome of a contest, while still maintaining sanctions for those individuals who engage in less serious gambling activities. Therefore, this legislation would increase sanctions for individuals involved in more serious gambling and sports wagering by making such student-athletes permanently ineligible. I urge your adoption. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 58 was adopted.]

### **Membership Requirements – Five-Sport/Three-Season Requirement – Penalty**

**Christopher Bledsoe** (New York University): On behalf of the NCAA Division III Membership Committee, the Management Council and the Presidents Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 59.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal makes a penalty applicable to an institution that fails to sponsor at least one sport per season consistent with the penalty applicable to an institution that does not sponsor the minimum number of sports overall. This proposal is far less punitive than the current legislation, which immediately places an institution that fails to meet the five-sport/three-season requirement into corresponding membership. It's important to make this change before the new five-sport/three-season requirement becomes effective August 1. I urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 59 was adopted.]

### **Enforcement — Penalties For Major Violations**

**Myrtes Dunn Green** (Stillman College): As a member of the Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 60.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will allow the Division III Committee on Infractions to impose reasonable financial penalties if major violations are found. It does provide for major cases an appropriate adoptive penalty option that currently exists in secondary infractions. The committee will not impose fines in every major infractions case. The Division III Committee on Infractions lists the following as criteria, developed by the Division I committee, that would be used in considering their position on the financial penalty. This list would accompany enforcement staff materials provided to an institution that is the subject of an investigation.

The list of criteria is as follows: (1) number and nature of the violations; (2) number and status of persons involved in the violations; (3) contributions by the ineligible student-athlete toward team success; (4) past infractions history of the institution; (5) cause of violations, institution, student-athlete, or both; (6) level of complicity by

institution or student-athlete, their actual knowledge, gross negligence, and not finding violations, etc.; (7) policies and procedures placed prior to the violations intended to prevent their occurrence; and (8) policies and procedures and remedial measures put in place after the violations to prevent their recurrence.

On behalf of the Committee on Infractions, the Management Council and the Presidents Council, I urge your support of the proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 60 was adopted.]

### **10-Semester/15-Quarter Extension Request – Eligibility For Practice**

**Christopher Walker** (University of Redlands): As a member of the Division III Management Council and Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement, and on behalf of the Presidents Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 61.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is designed with the student-athlete's welfare in mind. Under current NCAA regulations, the student-athlete who has exhausted his or her eligibility may not practice while an institution pursues an extension of the student's 10-semester/15-quarter time period of eligibility. The inability to practice may affect the student-athlete's physical conditioning and timing.

This legislation will permit student-athletes who have exhausted their eligibility to practice for a maximum of 30 consecutive calendar days while their waiver request is being processed by the NCAA staff. The committee noted that in some instances, waiver requests were delayed while the institution provides additional information that is necessary to process the request. Permitting student-athletes to practice for a maximum of 30 days while the waiver is being processed will ensure that in those instances in which the waiver is granted, student-athletes are physically prepared to engage in inter-collegiate competition and thus are less susceptible to injury. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 61 was adopted.]

### **Length of Playing Season – National Collegiate Sports**

**Mr. Johnson:** We should note that there is an editorial correction on Page 5 of your Convention Program. We are now ready to move on to Proposal 62.

**Suzanne Coffey** (Bates College): As a member of the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee, and on behalf of the Presidents Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal specifies that the sports of fencing, gymnastics, rifle, women's rowing, skiing, men's volleyball and water polo shall be limited to a playing and practice season of 21 weeks. This proposal will ensure that all Division III sports, including those that conclude

with a National Collegiate Championship, are limited to a playing and practice season of 21 weeks. Currently, the sports of fencing, gymnastics, rifle, women's rowing, skiing, men's volleyball and water polo are not limited to the 21-week playing and practice season. On behalf of the Division III ILC, I urge you to vote yes on Proposal No. 62. Thank you.

**John Schael** (Washington University, Missouri): I have a question, Walter. Should ice hockey be included in here and should women's rowing be taken out? Women's rowing is no longer a National Collegiate Championship because we just established a Division III championship. We have a separate championship now for women's ice hockey.

**Mr. Johnson:** That may be the case. We can refer that to ILC.

**Mr. Schael:** You might want to take a look at that with Proposal No. 63 as well. Thank you.

**Mr. Johnson:** Good point. Thank you very much, John. Any other speakers? We're ready to vote.

[Proposal No. 62 was adopted.]

### **Out of Season Athletically Related Activities – Summer Workout Sessions**

**Suzanne Coffey** (Bates College): As a member of the Division III ILC and on behalf of the Presidents Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 63.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will eliminate summer workout sessions in the sports of fencing, gymnastics, rifle, women's rowing and skiing. Current legislation permits summer workout sessions between coaches and student-athletes from the same institution in the sports of fencing, gymnastics, rifle, women's rowing and skiing. Summer workout sessions are not permitted in any other Division III sports. This proposal will standardize the out-of-season athletically related activities legislation in all Division III sports. On behalf of the Division III ILC, I urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 63 was adopted.]

### **Employment Deregulation Package**

**Suzanne Coffey** (Bates College): As chair of the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee and on behalf of the Division III ILC, I move the adoption of the employment deregulation package, Proposals 64 through 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

Over the past year, the committee has conducted a review of various pieces of legislation, Bylaws 10 through 17. The package before you is the result of that review. The committee agreed that employment issues should be dealt with in accordance with institutional policy as opposed to NCAA legislation. Toward that end, the committee identified legislation that could be deregulated. The committee also

identified legislation relating to employment matters that could be clarified through editorial revisions. On behalf of the Division III ILC, I urge your support of the employment deregulation package. Thank you.

**Mr. Johnson:** We will vote on this as a package unless there's a request for any portion of it to be removed. If that happens, we will vote on the remainder of the package first and then consider the proposals within the package individually in numerical order.

**Steve Ulrich** (Centennial Conference): I would like to move that Proposals 69 and 73 be removed from the package, please.

**Mr. Johnson:** Thank you. A motion is not necessary. This happens as the course of the parliamentary process. We are voting on the package minus 69 and 73. Seeing no one at the microphones, we are ready to vote.

[The deregulation package, except Proposals 69 and 73, was adopted.]

**Mr. Johnson:** Now we will consider Proposals 69 and 73.

**Suzanne Coffey** (Bates College): This proposal permits an institution to pay expenses incurred by a talent scout or representative of athletics interests in studying or recruiting prospects. Applicable recruiting regulations — no in-person, off-campus contact until the conclusion of a prospect's junior year — remains applicable. Matters related to the use of an institution's finances should be governed by institutional policy in accordance with the new general principle adopted in Proposal No. 64. Such policy may permit the reimbursement of expenses referenced earlier. I urge you to adopt this proposal. Thank you.

**Mr. Johnson:** Okay. We have already moved and seconded the total package, so we are now in the debate phase.

**Steve Erber** (Muhlenberg College): While I agree with the overall premise of 64, I just have concern about in Division III the ability to be able to hire a talent scout for recruiting.

**Mr. Johnson:** I'm sorry. Are you speaking to 69?

**Mr. Erber:** Yes, I am. It just seems that with the tremendous proliferation of recruiting activities, including in Division III, that eliminating this prohibition doesn't seem right to me. It just doesn't feel right for Division III. I wanted to raise the issue and see if there's any other people who feel the same way. But I would urge not voting for 69. Thank you.

Any other comments on 69?

**Tom Hart** (Webster University): As a small, private university, we don't have the extent of alumni across the country. We don't have the ability to pay individuals to go out and represent our institution, whether it be in Missouri, Illinois in the Midwest region. For that reason, I stand here and ask that we vote down the opportunity for people to be out and be our representatives and compensate those individuals. We're on a budget. We're not that big. The opportunity for people to extend their arms throughout the nation concerns us.

Thank you.

[Proposal 69 was defeated.]

**Mr. Johnson:** We are now ready for 73.

**Steve Argo** (Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference): Speaking on behalf of Proposal 73, this proposal eliminates specified prohibitions on employment and compensation of a high-school, preparatory school or two-year college coach employed in an institutional camp or clinic. The committee recommends the adoption of a new general principle, which specifies that the institution has complete control over who is to be employed and the amount of salary to be paid to that employee in accordance with institutional policy. Thus, these restrictions are no longer necessary. On behalf of the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee, I urge you to vote yes on Proposal 73.

**Steve Erber** (Muhlenberg College): For some of the same reasons relative to Proposal 69, even though I agree with the principle of the overall deregulation package, I think there's a lot of money involved in some sports camps, even at the Division III level. I think this particular issue has large potential for abuse — to pay a high school coach a significant amount of money — if you think that person can influence a prospective student-athlete to attend an institution. So for that reason, I would urge the defeat of 73. Thank you.

**Mr. Johnson:** We are ready to vote. The chair rules that the vote by paddle was too close to call. We are going to use the voting machine. Give them a few moments to get up to speed. While they're taking a moment to program, I think everyone would agree that our new voting system this year is a vast improvement over what we had in the past. (Applause.) I don't know who's in charge of it. I don't know who's responsible. But the applause is for you, whoever you are, wherever you are.

**Dick Kaiser** (Defiance College): Since there's a pause and we're waiting....

To vote or to bring up a revote on something that was either passed or denied, you must have voted on the majority side to bring that up. Is that correct?

**Mr. Johnson:** That is correct.

**Mr. Kaiser:** With that knowledge, with all the confusion of 49 and 50, I would encourage, because I know many people are waiting to leave once this last part is concluded, I would strongly urge you to consider coming back after the break.

**Mr. Johnson:** Thank you for that editorial comment. (Laughter.) I believe the voting machines are ready to go. We are voting on Proposal 73.

[Proposal No. 73 was adopted, 186-144-9.]

**Mr. Johnson:** That concludes this afternoon's legislative agenda. Thank you for your attention and your cooperation. (Applause.) We are a bit behind schedule, but we are going to take a break. We're going to take a five-minute break. Immediately following the break,

we will open the window to reconsideration to any of the proposals voted on earlier this afternoon. Again, please remember that the results of today's roll call votes are posted on the bulletin boards immediately outside of this room. We'd like you to return promptly in five minutes. That would be 4:05.

[Note: A brief recess was taken.]

## **WINDOW OF RECONSIDERATION**

**Mr. Johnson:** If we can please have the delegates come back into the room so we can proceed with this afternoon's session. We also have to go through the process of the window of reconsideration. We're ready to go.

The window of reconsideration is now open. As a reminder, a motion to reconsider can only be made by someone who voted on the prevailing side during the last vote. The motion can be seconded by any voting delegate. Reconsideration then occurs by majority vote. Finally, any reconsideration motion will require a roll-call vote since all of our proposals this morning were roll-call votes.

Is there a motion to reconsider any proposal that we voted on this morning from someone who voted on the prevailing side?

### **Maximum Dates of Competition – Baseball and Softball**

**Joe Baker** (University of Wisconsin, La Crosse): I request that we open the window of reconsideration for Proposal No. 49.

**Mr. Johnson:** Were you on the prevailing side?

**Mr. Baker:** Yes, I was.

[The motion was seconded.]

I believe that as we began our deliberations this morning, a request was made that we consider 50 first, which would have eliminated the confusion as we voted for 49 first. I believe there were many delegates here who were confused or misunderstood the question as called.

**Dick Kaiser** (Defiance College): I respectfully request that we reconsider the vote on 49 due to, as the gentleman said, the confusion. I think many individuals in this audience felt that we would get to 50, didn't understand the mootnicity sheet as it was presented to us and maybe didn't look at it as well. I think there are a lot of individuals who ended up voting in favor of 49, thinking that we'd get to 50, when 50 takes no one out of class, causes no one to miss any academics, and stands for the student welfare in terms of our athletes having the opportunity to compete only in vacation times. It also reduces, as many of you have noted, the five count for the fall. It still stays at 40, but allows the one tournament during vacation times only, which to me makes a lot more sense.

**Bette Landman** (Beaver College): It does seem to me that we in fact passed 49 in good faith. We did in fact deal with the issue that a tournament of multiple games would be counted as individual games. We also voted with our eyes open. It seems to me if there was a ques-



tion about one of the issues, it is not with 49, it is with 50.

**Mr. Johnson:** The chair needs to remind you that speaking privileges are granted to those individuals who have ribbons on their tags.

Seeing no other delegates at the microphones, we are ready to vote. We are voting on the motion to reconsider. This is not on the proposal but on the motion to reconsider. This is a roll call vote. We will use the voting machine. We are ready to vote. The polls are now open. This is on reconsideration of 49. The polls are now closed.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 49 was defeated, 151-168-3.]

**Mr. Johnson:** Are there any other motions for reconsideration? If not, the window of reconsideration is now closed. (Applause.) We have concluded our legislative voting.

I want to make a quick comment. If I could indulge the membership for a second. I am completing my sixth year of service on both the steering committee and the Management Council. It has been an honor, probably one of my greatest honors, to have the opportunity to serve you. Thank you very much. I now want to turn the microphone back over to President Die. (Applause.)

**Ms. Die:** The chair would like to recognize Joy Reign, vice-chair of the Management Council.

**Joy Reign** (Rowan University): Thank you, President Die. I'd just like to make a few comments before we close this part of the program. For the past three years, I've had the privilege of working on the Management Council and on a number of other committees with the outgoing chair, Walter Johnson. Many of you in this room have served on a number of committees, including the Management Council, and you understand and appreciate the commitment necessary to fulfill the responsibilities placed on us. I'd like to just take the opportunity to recognize and thank Walter for the job you've done over the past four years, particularly this past year as chair of the Management Council. On behalf of the Management Council and the Division III membership, I'd like to thank Walter for the outstanding job he did and the way he performed as chair of this body. The dedication and commitment that you gave and personal sacrifices that you made did not go unnoticed. I think that we've moved forward because of your leadership. In fact, we've even added a new word today and that's "unmooted." Anyway, the leadership and the guidance you gave us has really been appreciated. I'd just like to say congratulations and thank you, Walter. (Applause.)

**Ms. Die:** I want to add that it has been such a pleasure to work with Walter, to see his integrity, his character and his passion. His love for intercollegiate athletics is such that he gave six years of uninterrupted service. We appreciate that.

Our next session should prove very interesting. We have reserved most of the balance of the afternoon for it. Championships issues have occupied a great deal of governance structure time during the

last few years. That is not likely to change. However, with the implementation of the automatic qualifier principles last year, our focus has changed a bit. The championships selection process remains a focus. However, we also need to ask tough questions about the process relating to the bidding, site selection and the hosting of championships, because all of these factors play a crucial role in the success of our championships programs.

Representatives of the Championships Committee will review this topic. To begin our discussion, I would like to introduce Joy Reign, who has been introduced to you earlier today. Joy is the director of athletics at Rowan University. Joy chairs the Championships Committee and also serves as Management Council vice-chair. She will be chair of the Management Council next year. Joy.

## **CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE FORUM**

**Joy Reign** (Rowan University): Thank you, President Die. Today's forum is conducted by the Championships Committee, and it is our goal to address three areas of interest and concern to the membership. The areas covered will be the automatic qualification time line, hosting a championship and site selection criteria.

Before we begin, I'd like to introduce the members of the Championships Committee, as well as the people who will be on the panel today. If these people would stand: Brad Bankston, commissioner of the ODAC; Amy Campbell, athletic director at Bryn Mawr College; Dee Fairchild, athletic director at Grinnell College; Mary Jo Gunning, athletic director at Marywood University; Walter Johnson, athletic director at North Central College; Kurt Norman, SAAC representative; Louise O'Neal, athletic director at Wellesley College; Truman Turnquist, faculty athletic rep at Mount Union; and Chris Pohl, director of championships at the NCAA. These people make up the Championships Committee. If they would please stand. (Applause.) People on the panel today will be Ed Farrington from Western Connecticut; Walter Johnson from North Central; and Susan Bassett.

There are a number of issues that the Championships Committee is in the process of evaluating. The main focus of this presentation will be to inform the membership so you will have a better understanding of the automatic qualification process, and we hope to encourage institutions to become interested in hosting NCAA championships at all levels.

We'll begin with the automatic qualification and selection principle time line. I would ask you to hold questions. At the end of each section we will open it up for questions and discussion with the membership. We'll begin with the automatic qualification time line that's been set up. Just to give you a little background, in January 1999, the automatic-qualifying legislation was adopted. Further into 1999, in April, the Management and Presidents Council approved recommendations to increase team sport access ratio from 8.1 to 7.5. The pres-

idents made it clear, however, that no significant changes would take place or be addressed for two full academic years.

The first full year of the automatic qualifying situation was in 1999 to 2000. There were no significant changes. There was also a moratorium put on by the Management Council on provisional membership. This was adopted and effective immediately from 2001 to 2002. There were some concerns as to how we would handle the additional schools and institutions coming into Division III.

We're now in the second full year of the automatic-qualifying process. Again, there will be no significant changes. However, we do understand that the winter and spring sports have yet to go through the second full year. So officially, the end of the spring championships will be the completion of this second full year. We can begin to address some of your concerns that you have about this process.

The next academic year, 2001-02, the governance structure will review automatic qualification. Information will be gathered from the membership, the sports committees and the Championships Committee for us to look at and determine what would be the best route for this membership to go. Also this year, the first year of the five, the new five-and-five sports sponsorship requirement will go into effect. If any revisions are to be made, this would occur before 2002 and 2003. This would be the implementation of the revised process. Also in this year, the provisional membership moratorium will expire.

Now, we know some of you have given us some of your suggestions. We'd like to share with you examples of what some significant changes to this automatic-qualifying process would be. Some of you had said we need more flexibility in the placement of teams within the brackets. Again, this could involve additional funding. Other suggestions have included combining pools B and C. In fact, some people have even considered dropping out of the conference and becoming an independent.

As for access ratio revision bracket expansion the Championships Committee will study this. For example, if there were no Pool C, we would make every effort to assure equitable access to all three pools. This may mean expansion, thus additional dollars. Other suggestions were to change the minimum number of conference members. Currently, it's seven. Is this appropriate? This is something we would ask you. Also, there's been a suggestion to have multiple bids for conferences with 14 or more members.

We've also gotten automatic qualification principles feedback and recommendations. These are categories that seem to fit feedback from the membership. One area is regional alignment. Another area is the evaluation regions. We've been asked to possibly redefine the evaluation regions. There's also regions plus a radius. For example, in your region, you may have a school that's 30 miles from you that's not in your region. It may be in the next state. But somebody in your region could be 250 miles away. People have asked why they can't

have a region plus an additional radius where we could play schools that are closer to our institutions.

Number two, regional alignment when teams are paired into the bracket. Basically, teams are clustered according to geographic proximity.

Another recommendation, selection and evaluation process for pools B and C. Number one, berths from pools B and C selected on a national basis using regional selection criteria. Again, I'll remind you that these are suggestions and ideas that have been brought to the committee for consideration. Number two, why not separate pools B and C or combine them? Three, appropriate time to move from primary to secondary criteria. That's an issue that we've heard a number of times throughout the last year-and-a-half with the selection process if there's an inconsistency or when the committee moves from the primary to the secondary criteria. Then there's the size, length and timing of the championship. Is it large enough? Is it long enough? Is the timing right? These are some of the things that we will be considering.

Some things for your information. There's been discussion on the determination of conference champions. Each conference has the autonomy to determine who their conference representative is going to be, whether it's through a tournament or whether it's through regular-season play. Number one, designated by the conference at the time it completes its automatic qualifying declaration form. As I said a minute ago, that can be regular-season competition or your season-ending tournament. That's up to the conference.

Another area was a champion must be determined not later than the date from which participants are selected for the NCAA championship. There's been a little bit of discrepancy on when you have to end your conference championship. Realistically, you look to the bylaws, you have until Sunday midnight to declare who your conference representative is going to be.

Automatic qualifier requirements per Bylaw 31.3.4.2. You have to be a member of a conference of the Association for two consecutive academic years. You must have conducted competition in the sport for two consecutive years and have at least seven active members that sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis that are eligible for the NCAA championship and have at least seven active members that are eligible for the NCAA championship to participate in the process that determines you're an automatic qualifier. Also, at least 50 percent of conference members must sponsor a minimum of three men's and three women's team sports. Also, single-sport conferences in existence before February 1, 1998, do not have to meet this minimum sport sponsorship requirement; they're grandfathered in.

Geographic proximity and travel policies were other issues. Teams are grouped in clusters according to natural geographic proximity. Teams are paired according to geographic proximity. Two teams within 400 miles of each other could be paired and are paired

in the same bracket. Basically, what we want to try to do is maintain balance of that bracket. However, a team may be moved in order to maintain that balance. Of course, the thing that always comes up is we try to keep flights to a minimum. Teams may be seeded on a regional basis using the regional selection criteria. Geographic proximity takes precedence over seeding. But there is a possibility that a number one and a number two seed could play each other, possibly because of the size of the region and to avoid a flight. For teams from the same conference, we try to not have them play one another in the first round as long as geographic proximity is maintained.

The Championships Committee continues to look at some of these things, but we need to balance what it is we can do with the resources that we have available. If all site-selection criteria are equal, transportation, etc., then the highest-seeded team will be selected as the host. Please note the geographic proximity takes precedent over seed in pairing. Number one seeds in brackets with byes automatically receive a bye in the first round regardless of geographic proximity.

Another issue is scheduling criteria. There's a minimum number of contests in region to standardize comparative data. Should institutions be required to play a minimum number of contests in their region when we've heard that some schools are having trouble playing schools within their region? Schools are refusing to play them. They're being forced to go out of their region in order to get competition.

Then we'd like to talk just a little bit about the access ratio as it relates to the size of the bracket. This is how we define the size of the bracket. For every 7.5 team sport members that sponsor the sport, one team will receive a bid. Pool A consists of the number of conferences that meet the automatic-qualification requirements. Those are the conferences that are in Pool A. Pool B is made up of a number of independent institutions plus the number of institutions from conferences that do not meet the automatic qualification requirements. That bracket is divided by the bracket access ratio in that sport.

I'll give you an example. The number of eligible institutions by the bracket size. So if there are 358 eligible institutions divided by a 48-team bracket, that's where you get the ratio of 1:7. Another example is 54 institutions that are in conferences that do not receive automatic qualification and 13 independents. The bracket ratio in that sport will be 1-7.46. As a result, there would be eight berths in Pool B, which would equal 8.98, which rounded out would be eight. If rounding is necessary, please note that the number is rounded downward. An additional berth is only provided when the next whole number is achieved. If the number of institutions being considered in Pool B is less than the access ratio, those institutions would be considered in Pool C.

Probably the biggest area of concern and interest is the size of Pool C. That bracket size minus the number in Pool A would be

berths. This would be on a national selection basis with a team's win-loss record within its region and conference.

Geographically isolated institutions are another issue that has been brought up. Some of them having scheduling problems, not feeling they have the opportunity to host because of their location. Then we've had a question that has been raised about the automatic-qualifying principles as they apply to individual team sports. We would say if we were to apply them, how would we apply them? How should that be done?

This was basically designed to take you through a nutshell. Most of you in this room are aware of this setup. We wanted to review it again. For those who may be new and provisional members who are in the back listening, we just wanted to bring this to your attention. At this point, we'd like to open it to questions and discussion. However, we'd ask that you not make it institution specific but more or less what are some of the genuine concerns and how we, the Championships Committee, can address this later on in the academic year.

If anyone doesn't want to get up and speak to the mike, we do have a comment form. We certainly would ask you to fill that out or e-mail it to Chris or anybody on the Championships Committee. I'll do whatever I can today to answer some of your questions and Chris is here to help as well.

**John Schael** (Washington University, Missouri): I have a couple of comments. We're honored to be a part of the NCAA championship format. One question that continues to arise in Division III has to do with the seeding based on geography. I know there are some instances where there's a tournament held and you have the number one, number two, number three, and number five team in the same region. There's no separation, so that creates some problems in terms of credibility of your tournament.

The second question I have, I don't know whether you addressed it, has to do with the increase in travel parties. I can only refer to one sport and that would be volleyball where we went from 18 in the travel party to 21. If you multiply the three additional travelers by the number of teams that are in the championship, which is 48, that's 144 additional people. I think you could probably expand your bracket and include an additional six institutions for that championship opportunity, which seems to make at least sense for some consideration.

Also, there was one other matter and that had to do with basketball. I know when we were in San Diego a few years back, we had that play-in round for men's and women's basketball. It seemed to work very well. I think the athletic directors were very much in support of that. I would hope that perhaps the committee could take a look at that option and that opportunity again. Once again, we would be serving the student-athletes. Thank you.

**Joy Reighn** (Rowan University): Thank you, John. We have dis-

cussed some of these at the Championships Committee meeting. Again, we will continue to do that and take some of these thoughts into consideration.

**Jim Nelson** (Suffolk University): My concern has to do with first-round byes, particularly for teams that would play on a Wednesday or Thursday night while their next possible opponent is waiting Saturday for them. Has there been some discussion as to how to deal with the elimination of byes and John's comments relative to the players who go first-round-byeing into the tournament to eliminate that situation.

**Mr. Reign:** Jim, to answer your question, we haven't had much discussion on that issue at all but we will bring that up.

**Noreen O'Malley** (Chatham College): A point of clarification, because we've gotten mixed messages from the NCAA. If a conference meets all the requirements for an AQ that you outlined before, does that automatically mean you will get one? If not, then what are the criteria for selection to get an automatic berth for a conference?

**Ms. Reign:** Yes, if your conference meets all the criteria, as specified by the bylaws, then you will get an automatic bid and you will be in Pool A. Part of the criteria is the number of teams in the conference, the number of years you've been in there. If you don't meet that criteria, then you would move into Pool B because you are in a conference that does not meet the automatic qualification criteria at that time. That will be up to your conference to go through whatever the process is to be able to get an automatic qualifier. If it means adding teams to your conference or sports or whatever.

**Tim Gleason** (Ohio Athletic Conference): One of the provisions was that two teams from the same conference would not meet in the first round if the geography was favorable for that. I would suggest that you extend that to at least a second round so that two teams in the same conference are not facing each other, as long as the geography is favorable. I understand if a flight is involved and the cost and whatnot. But in other words, two teams from the same league should possibly be separated as far as they can be as long as the geography is favorable, not just the first round.

**Ms. Reign:** Thanks, Tim, for that remark. I know that is one area of concern among conferences. Let's take the sport of basketball. You play two times a year. Then you have a conference tournament, get into the NCAA and you want to see somebody different. The committee understands that. That's why there has been a concerted effort over the past few years by the sports committees to try not to do that. Again, we will look into that and put that on our agenda.

**Mike Gentile** (Empire Eight Conference): To follow up on an earlier question, if as a conference you meet all of the criteria for qualifying for an AQ, can you as a conference decide not to declare or apply for that? If so, what happens to the teams in your conference in that sport?

**Ms. Reign:** Currently, you can do that. If your conference

chooses not to submit or request an automatic qualification, then you would be in Pool B. That would be my understanding.

**Dennis Collins** (North Coast Athletic Conference): You indicated the minimum number for a conference to have an automatic qualifier is currently seven within the last couple of years. I just wondered what kind of feedback have you had? How is that number working? You indicated you might have had other requests for a different number. Could you share with us where that may be going?

**Ms. Reign:** That is just one of the suggestions we were looking at when we earlier said that seven is appropriate. We don't know. We're waiting for the membership or somebody to say maybe it should be more, maybe it should be less. Another number has not been brought before the Championships Committee at this time.

**Ed Hegmann** (Mary Washington College): I have two questions. The first centers on individual/team sports. I have an observation and some concern. The sport of men's and women's tennis is unique in that even though it's called an individual/team sport, it's the only one that when we get to the national championships, there are teams going head to head. It's different from swimming, track, cross country and so forth.

I noticed that we have new legislation coming on board, recommendations about things like conflicts with graduation and conflicts with religious dates. They're only concerning team sports. But when you come to men's and women's tennis, it's really an individual and a team sport. It keeps getting lumped into just the individual sports. I think that needs to be looked at because we've had some serious conflicts in the past with graduations versus team-individual sport competition.

**Ms. Reign:** I can tell you that the tennis situation has been discussed at the last championships meeting. Nothing formally has been brought to us by the membership. Members of the committee brought it up in discussing where we want to go. It is something that has been discussed and I'm sure it will be discussed further.

**Mr. Hegmann:** The second thing is an observation. As an athletic director, sometimes we're in a position to support NCAA championships committees and sport committees in their decisions as to where teams have to go to play in national championship formats. As you mentioned, geographic proximity is supposed to take precedent over seeding. So we're trying to soothe their fears and whatnot.

This past fall, flipping through *The NCAA News*, I happened to see that in the sport of football, that a team from Maryland and a team from Virginia were both flown down to play teams in Texas. Then the two Texas teams happened to win and they had to play each other. My question is: How do we explain those kinds of things to our coaches? Do we say football is different or what?

**Ms. Reign:** I'm talking with Chris because I'm not familiar right off the cuff of the specifics of those brackets — whether they would have had to create flights either way or not. I'm not sure whether



that region was already preset to play the other region. We really need more information. We're not trying to dodge you. Although I was ducking up here a minute ago, we're not trying to dodge you. (Laughter.)

**Dick Kaiser** (Defiance College): I'm the chair of the Men's Division III Golf Committee. My question to you, Joy, and the Championships Committee is when does an individual-team sport have the opportunity to take on purely a team sport and increase the opportunities for student-athletes to participate since we, quite frankly, could have a team championship without any individual championships?

**Ms. Reign**: Those are things that could come through the sports committee, that sport-specific committee.

**Paul Hoseth** (Pacific Lutheran University): The criteria that we use on the football committee are the same basically for selection and for seeding. The last two years in football in the West Region, we've had the No. 7 seed, which is the bottom seed to make it to the championship event. I'm not questioning the intelligence of that committee in the seeding process, but it's happened. It is not an exact science.

Is there flexibility to allow the possibility for a team to host, as opposed to in this situation, travel for five weeks in a row? It seems to me that since we don't have an exact science on the seeding, but we give essentially preference all the time to the top-seeded team, it creates a problem for both people who are traveling and in some cases a hardship to host for that many weeks as well.

**Ms. Reign**: Yes, it is something that the committee is looking at. One of the areas is the whole hosting process in general. We are aware of situations that have happened like that, particularly in football. But it is an area that we are addressing.

The next section of the presentation will be site-selection criteria. Chris Pohl, the director of championships for Division III at the NCAA, will go through this phase of the program. Chris.

**Chris Pohl** (NCAA Staff): Actually, instead of going over site-selection criteria, I thought maybe we'd change topics and talk about mootnicity criteria. (Laughter.)

Really, part of the idea about this presentation is to demystify the site-selection criteria process and really ask the Division III membership to consider hosting NCAA championships. Sometimes I think we make things a little more difficult than they have to be. Obviously, we do have criteria in order to try to attain the best possible championship experience for student-athletes and participants. So there are hoops to jump through, but we're hoping this presentation will make understanding the criteria a little bit easier and the process a little bit easier.

The criteria for hosting NCAA championships and how sites are selected are contained in the NCAA Manual. If you are interested in learning about the criteria that pertain to championships, I encour-

age you to refer to Bylaw 31. The criteria for hosting championships and for selecting sites have been prioritized by the Division III Championships Committee, and we'll review those in priority order.

The first criterion is the quality and availability of the facility and other accommodations. That has to do with the competition facility, things like hotels and other necessary accommodations. The sports committee is responsible for determining what those specific criteria are for that sport. Those criteria are typically reflected in the facility evaluation forms that many of you fill out if you're interested in hosting championships. When the sports committee selects sites, it doesn't mean that it automatically selects the site that has the absolute best in terms of quality and it doesn't necessarily mean that it's solely available. There may be other things happening on campus at that time. There are other considerations when the committee selects sites and I'll talk about those in a little bit.

The second prioritized criterion is related to geographic location factors, including rotation of the site. Some sports committees have established regional rotation of sites. Weather, to a certain extent, is considered. Accessibility — how can we with ease get folks to the championships — and transportation costs also are considered. Sometimes transportation costs are called geographic proximity. Geographic proximity in Division III means a 400-mile radius. For distances up to 400 miles, the NCAA asks you to drive. We reimburse you for that. If it's beyond that, then the sports committees do not have the authority to pair teams or select sites if flights are created. So that's a very important criteria.

The third prioritized criterion is seeding. So if number one and two are met, then seeding comes into play.

The fourth criterion, again, after one, two, and three are met, has to do with attendance history and to a lesser degree revenue potential. I think attendance history and revenue potential are somewhat related in that many folks believe that if all other things are equal, then attendance history, to a certain extent, increases the experience for the student-athletes and participants and that's why it's in there, although it is the fourth criteria.

There are other things that are outlined in the Manual for Division III. There is some discussion about what a nonpredetermined site is. A nonpredetermined site is a site that's selected typically when the sports committee is selecting teams. They are selecting both teams and sites. So there isn't much advance notice for who's hosting the championship. Obviously, the championship is conducted on one of the campuses of the participating institutions.

Another bit of information that's outlined in the Manual in terms of definition is on-campus versus off-campus sites. Typically, preference is given to educational institutions unless there are compelling reasons for championships to be conducted off campus. Some compelling reasons for some sports committees have to do with facility limitations. There are some campuses that don't have facilities that

can accommodate the size of NCAA championships. Swimming, for example, comes to mind. There are few Division III campuses that can host the size of a Division III championship.

Other issues that come up for championships have to do with media attendance and whether ancillary facilities on campuses can accommodate not only the number of fans attending, but the media attending.

The Division III Championships Committee does have the ability to reconsider a host institution if the student-athletes at that institution are not eligible to compete in the championship.

Another point of information for you has to do with nonrevenue championship site assignment. Ed earlier was talking about how teams are paired into a bracket and how hosts are selected. You probably are aware that for team championships that do not generate revenues, those pairings have to be based primarily on the teams' geographic proximity to one another regardless of their region. That goes back to the fact that we can't create flights when we're pairing teams and we're selecting hosts. We have to be mindful of that.

Obviously, the Championships Committee, with input from the membership, has the ability to make modifications. Really, it's a matter of resources, to a certain extent. Division III has an amount of resources available to it to run all programs, including championships. So in some ways, it's a matter of trade-offs. Did you loosen up the criteria for pairing teams in favor, for example, seeding? At what cost does that come? Does that mean that we can't perhaps expand brackets? It's how you feel about those kinds of issues that the Championships Committee debates fairly readily.

Waivers may be granted by the Championships Committee upon the recommendation of a sports committee when determining host institutions. For example, typical hosts for national championships are selected where the majority of Division III members who are competing in the championship are located in an attempt to try to reduce transportation costs. We have had instances where the Championships Committee, upon recommendation of the sports committee, has allowed different parts of the country to host NCAA championships. In part, that's so other parts of the country get to observe that championship at a national level and see what that's about and all the good that comes from hosting that event on your campus and in your community.

I want to talk just a minute about what the process is for sports committees. The first step in the process, obviously, is that there's a national committee for every sport. Many of those sports have regional advisory committees. Regional advisory committees and the national committees throughout the season evaluate the teams in a variety of ways. They collect an inordinate amount of information, sometimes through conference offices, sometimes through institutions' sports information offices. Regardless, they're evaluating the teams for possible selection to the championship.

Typically, midway through the process, the national committee begins to identify those institutions who typically are very competitive within the bracket and will likely have an opportunity to host the championship. With that identification from the sports committees, that then triggers our office to send out what we call a proposed budget mailing to those institutions.

Sports committees do not typically send the proposed budget mailing to all 300 institutions that sponsor the sport. It's likely that most of those teams, since there are a finite number of folks to host the championship, given the size of bracket, will not host. So really it would be a waste of our resources to do that kind of a mailing and also a waste of your time and resources to have to cull through that paper. We try to pare that down.

The proposed budget mailing is fairly simple. It really contains three components. One is the facility questionnaire that's developed by the sports committee. It's an attempt to try to determine whether the facility and the necessary accommodations are championship-ready. There are a series of questions that are asked related to your competition site.

The second element of the proposed budget mailing is the proposed budget itself. That can be a little bit arduous. I've got a couple of examples I'll show you. But really, all the proposed budget asks you to do is to estimate what it's going to cost your campus to put the tournament on and what you can expect in terms of revenue. How many people you're going to have attend the championship multiplied by the ticket price. Typically, those are estimates.

If you have questions, if you're a first-timer in this process, I recommend that you call some of your colleagues. You're welcome to call our office. We usually don't share specific information about what an institution spent, but we certainly have information to get you in the ballpark. How much do we spend on promotions for a first-round women's lacrosse game? I don't know. Can you help me? We're happy to answer that kind of information.

I would recommend that you either contact the chair of that specific sports committee or the staff liaison. A couple of other things that are in the proposed budget mailing is a contact form. That's a one-page sheet that asks you to fill out information about the key tournament personnel. We also ask for insurance information should you host the championship.

Once the proposed budget mailing is sent out, then the committee prepares a budget chart. I have a snapshot of what that looks like. The national office prepares budget charts. And for every bid we receive, we put in the expenses that the institution intends to spend. We put in the revenue it intends to generate. We also incorporate what rounds it intends to host so that at the time the committee is selecting the teams and selecting the potential hosts, they have all that information available to them at the time of selections.

We also prepare for the committee a mileage chart. For every

team that's under consideration, we prepare a mileage chart that is gargantuan at best. If there are 80 teams that are in contention to be selected, we'll do a grid that has 80 institutions by 80 institutions and we will know mileage from your campus to any of the other institutions that are potentially going to be selected. Obviously, geographic proximity is an important part of this process.

Once we collect all of that information and prepare it for the committee, the committee then convenes and selects the teams. After that, the committee uses the team-selection criteria that are outlined in the sport handbooks to select the teams. Once the teams are selected, they're all put on a map so we know where everybody's located. The next step is to select a host and prepare teams.

So that's pretty much it in a nutshell. There's not really a lot to it. Not. There's a ton to it. It's a big process. It's an awesome responsibility, as you can imagine. I have a sample of what a facility questionnaire looks like. I'm sure you can all see it vividly. The sports committees are challenged each year to simplify this process, to ask basic and necessary questions to make sure that when we select host institutions, that we have basic, necessary information to make sure it's a quality experience.

Some of the membership has asked often about making some of these forms available on our Web site. We're in the process of trying to figure out how we can best do that. If you're interested in hosting a specific sport, it's available on the Web site, you fill it out, e-mail it to us, and it just makes things a lot easier. Right now for us it's a matter of resources.

I have a copy of a key contact form. It's a one-page sheet. We don't care if it's typewritten, as long as it's legible.

The next page is a sample of the first page of the proposed budget mailing. It's a multipage form. It's about six or seven pages. The expenses are broken down by section. Again, if you need information about how do you even go about starting to fill out these forms, you're welcome to call a colleague or simply welcome to call any of us on the national office staff.

I have a copy of a reduced sample of what we create for the committee. You can see that we typically divide the chart by region. We list every institution that has displayed an interest in hosting and has sent in the appropriate paperwork. We talk about receipts, we talk about expenses and which round you're interested in hosting.

The last sample we have is just a football mileage chart. Again, that's a very small copy of something that looks pretty large once we get 80 teams times 80 in there.

There are several items that the Championships Committee is interested in receiving feedback from you on. I would strongly recommend that on the comment forms that you have at your places, that you really consider questions that you have. How we can make the process easier? How can we make it better for you? When looking at hosting and pairing, what kinds of things do you want champi-

onships to look at, recognizing that it's an allocation-of-resource question and times?

There are a couple of things you should know about predetermined versus nonpredetermined sites. The majority of Division III sites are nonpredetermined. We have a handful of championships that are predetermined and they're mostly national sites. Division III men's and women's basketball are predetermined, swimming championships are predetermined, track and field is predetermined. Some of those are predetermined in order to allow for advanced planning. Some of the individual-team sports are very cumbersome, as many of you who have hosted the championships know. There's no possible way to get your place ready for a championship with only a week's advance notice. Some of those sites are established a year or two out.

You might ask yourself why are some predetermined and some not predetermined? Really, to a certain extent, it's based on sport committee recommendations. Is it best for the championship experience for us to have a national championship site that's predetermined? Or does it work better if it's conducted on the campus of one of the participating institutions? Consequently, for nonpredetermined we have a better chance of attracting more people to attend the championship. So we don't feel like this championship is ready for that advance warning.

As I said, more final sites are predetermined. We have some examples here. As I know you are well aware of, predetermined sites provide more planning time. You might ask yourself why don't we have more predetermined sites? Again, it goes back to the comment I just made. Some sports committees don't feel that that's in the best interest of the championship experience, so they haven't chosen to go in that direction. We're happy to hear your comments about that, however.

The other thing you should know is that predetermined sites are determined by the Division III Championships Committee and nonpredetermined sites are selected and approved by the sports committee and don't go to the Division III Championships Committee for approval. There isn't time for that approval process. The sports committee does have the authority to do that, which was the next point up there.

One issue that's been raised by the Division III membership, that I know the Division III Championships Committee is interested in your feedback on, is the concept of a Division III sports festival. We're seeking your feedback about that. That could happen in a variety of ways. It could combine several sports at one site. It could combine a team sport and an individual sport. Think about that concept. Obviously, there would have to be considerable thought given to length and timing of the regular seasons. Some folks believe that might be a good concept for Division III. I encourage you to think about that and provide feedback about that.

Some folks have asked if in Division III — and the

Championships Committee is interested in your feedback about this — it is best for Division III that we host our championships on campus versus off campus? Does that better emphasize what our philosophy is in Division III? One thing that I hit on earlier is in some situations, off-campus sites may be more conducive to the needs of the championship. Issues that are wrapped into the concept of off-campus sites have to do with the size of the facility and whether television is involved and whether on-campus facilities can accommodate those kinds of things.

Could all championships be conducted on campus? The answer is probably yes. It says strongly yes up there. I would say probably yes. But there may be some limitations and some of them are related to facilities and television and some of those other things I hit on.

There are a couple of questions you might ask yourself if you're interested in hosting NCAA championships. What I would say to you, if you're trying to answer the question if your facility is of championship quality, if your team has a chance to be in the championship and you believe that your institution may be championship ready, I would encourage you to complete the paperwork on a conservative approach. You have nothing to lose except a tiny bit of time by filling out that paperwork. I don't mean to underestimate the effort that goes into the paperwork.

On the other side of that, if you don't fill out the paperwork, then you're not going to have a chance to be eligible to host. We've had institutions in the past make a decision that they felt like they probably weren't going to host. They felt like they might not even be selected. As it turned out, they had a relatively good chance for both, and had they put in the paperwork, they could have been in position to host a championship. So I would encourage you to think about hosting NCAA championships.

You should ask yourself if your institution has any conflicts during the time of the championship? Are you hosting some other major event that could impact on not only the facility, but the other necessary accommodations that we talked about? Hotels, parking, your own staff? What you need to ask yourself is does your facility meet the minimum requirements for hosting? As I said earlier, the facility may not be the best of all of the options around the country, but does it meet the minimum requirements? The sports committees, as you probably know, have numerous factors to consider. They have to do with the priority order we talked about earlier.

I think I pretty much have hit on geographical locations. Geographical location really has to do with pairing teams. We talked a little bit about seeding. I think I have driven home the point adequately enough that seeding is taken into consideration but not after number one and number two, and the concept of geographical proximity. Then finally, attendance history and revenue potential.

I'm happy to take a little bit of time if you have any questions. I've run through some of this information fairly quickly. The next por-

tion of our program is a panel discussion about hosting an NCAA championship. We've got folks to talk in a bit more detail. I'm happy to answer any questions.

**Connie Zotos** (Drew University): The soccer championship is reluctant to allow any rounds on certain surfaces. There are new surfaces out there much more grass-like and approved for at least the first few rounds of the World Cup. Yet there still is this reluctance. I wondered if the Championships Committee would be willing to hear those concerns, or does it have to stay with the individual-sport committee?

**Ms. Pohl:** I would say that the general tenet is that the sports committee has the specific knowledge about that sport. If it's possible to go through the sports committee with your concern, I would not keep that group out of the loop. I also would encourage you to, on the evaluation feedback for this session, to express your concern. It might be an opportunity for the Championships Committee to remand it back to the soccer committee to study in a little more complete way, not suggesting that they hadn't studied it in a complete way. It's been a fairly controversial issue, as you know, throughout quite a few years with soccer. But those are a couple of ways you might get feedback.

**Ms. Zotos:** Thank you.

**Marvin Zuidema** (Calvin College): My remarks are dealing a little bit with predetermined sites. I'm looking for the Championship Committee to give some more guidance to the sports committees on exactly what those criteria incentives would be. For example, here are five very short ones I'll make for you.

One is what do you want for sponsoring agents? Do you prefer colleges, do you prefer conferences or do you prefer some agent that is a sport or city-type agent? I think that's questionable among all the sports right now.

Number two is revenue or profit incentive. How much should that be? I think that's something we ought to take a look up front.

Expectations and incentives would be another thing. How much incentives would you like for each one? I'm talking about banquets, support personnel available to host these things, gifts, those types of things. I think those things need to be addressed.

My fourth one is the experience criteria. You've been trying to suggest that we get others to make bids. Well, you can't base it all on experience then. Because not all of us are going to have those experiences, although some of us have those.

And finally, sometimes for the predetermined site, the cost to make a bid is quite expensive for the parties involved. Somehow, that's going to eliminate some from making bids. So those are five ideas I have.

**Ms. Pohl:** Thanks, Marv. Marv, hopefully you'll make sure that those are on that form so we have a specific track. The Championships Committee has begun to delve into some of those. For



folks who have been in the process and folks who are having those kinds of concerns, certainly those are some things the Championships Committee is definitely interested in hearing about. What does the Division III membership want? What's best for the championship experiences?

**Frank O'Brien** (University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point): I'm not sure whether this is the appropriate place for this. It was wonderful to see all the initiatives and places that we're going. But I have a concern about ground transportation when we go to a major metropolitan area for a championship. Let me just briefly explain.

In an earlier round of the tournament, one of our teams was in an accident on a charter bus. Of course, everybody thought I was a very bright guy because they weren't in vans, they were on a bus. I didn't disagree with them at that point. But a couple of weeks later, we went to a major metropolitan area. It happened to be a place where I certainly wouldn't have put the teams in vans and encourage them to get from the airport to where they were going. The competition site was 15 miles by ground transportation from the hotel. So we're in a position of having to get buses. But the long and short of it is ground transportation for four days cost us \$1,700 and there was no way we could have done it any cheaper because there was a minimum cost for that bus for that time.

Is there any flexibility or can there be any flexibility when circumstances dictate? There was no way I was putting those student-athletes in vans given the competition site and all of the variables that surrounded that and given what happened two weeks earlier when they were actually in an accident on a charter bus.

I'm wondering if some money can be directed or redirected towards ground transportation during championships when it's not a matter of the competition site being a mile from your hotel when you can shuttle them over there in a van. When the competition site is 15 minutes by interstate from the headquarters hotel, you're asking for trouble when you're putting teams in two or three vans and sending them out to try to find their way back and forth.

**Ms. Pohl:** I would say two things. Number one, certainly the Championships Committee is open to those kinds of ideas. If you have creative thoughts about how to deal with some of these issues, I think the more specific and creative you can be, the better. We certainly have precedent in some of our other divisions about how to address some of these divisional specific issues, whether related to ground transportation or how the division wants to allocate its resources. If Division III wants to spend more of its resources in paying attention to ground transportation, we just need to have some creative ideas about how to do that and how it best works for Division III. That's number one.

The second thing is, I would encourage you if you have specific issues that come up during the course of the championships that call for a different remedy than what is prescribed in the travel and

reimbursement policies, then contact our office. We have somebody specifically in charge of approving those kinds of requests. Contact our office so that perhaps something can be done at that point in time for you. I'm not saying that it could be, but it's a process that you could go through in the meantime while the circumstance comes up.

**Mr. O'Brien:** I understand. I have requested ground transportation consideration. They're pretty firm on the fact that if the site is within 30 miles of the airport, that that's not happening.

**Ms. Pohl:** So the next step might be the Division III Championships Committee looking at some policy changes.

**Unidentified Delegate:** Quick question. Getting to the distribution of bid proposals that are sent out to the institutions. In particular, about adoption of the AQ. In the past, the committee would send those packets to those teams they considered to be having a successful season. I'm wondering, and it may be occurring, if the key happens to get hot, if they happen to have a postseason conference tournament and somebody who wasn't having that great of a season could end up in the tournament, and if they don't have that bid package, not have the opportunity to host. I'm wondering if there have been any changes to that distribution.

**Ms. Pohl:** Yes, that is happening. I know sports committees are being more liberal with sending out proposed budget information for that very reason. You'll also notice more last-minute workings by sports committees because teams are quickly moving up at the end of the season and obviously the sports committees try as best they can do that. So we don't put the sports committee or the institution in a time crunch. But yes, sports committees are considering that as a result of adoption in the process. It's a good point.

**Joann Andregg** (University of St. Thomas, Minnesota): After hosting several championships, I discovered some inconsistencies in the championship handbook. I would like to see someone take each of those championship handbooks and look for those inconsistencies, especially men's and women's basketball. The championship handbook is the same, but if you read what the per diem for officials in men's basketball versus women's basketball is, it is not spelled out the same. It causes confusion every time you go to host these events. Especially with my institution where on one night you're hosting a men's championship and two nights later you may be hosting a women's championship. I would just urge that you look at each of those handbooks and take out the inconsistencies and get it clarified.

The other area I have problem with is the number of passes to the competition. You don't seem to take into consideration that the traveling team could possibly have their athletic director with them and I'm not allowed to give them a pass to the game, based on the number that you've set in the championships manual. Thank you.

**Ms. Pohl:** The numbers that you're talking about, taking the men's and women's basketball handbook into consideration, are determined by respective sports committees. So the men's basketball

committee may have different numbers, for example, related to both of the topics that you brought up, as it compares to the women's basketball committee. I think one thing we have discussed is if there's a beau coup of us in the membership, to ask those groups to get together when it makes sense to be consistent. Is that better for everybody? Some of that is going on more than it needs to go on.

I'm going to turn the mike back over to Joy. We're going to be around the rest of today. We'll be happy to answer any other questions you might have as well.

**Ms. Reign:** Thank you, Chris. For the last portion of our forum today, we have asked three individuals who have hosted different types of championships to come up and share some of the experiences and the things involved with hosting. To start off with, I'm going to ask each one to give a two- to three-minute piece on exactly the attitude, the excitement involved with hosting. I'm going to start off with Susan Bassett, the director of athletics at William Smith College. Susan is going to be speaking today from the perspective of nonpredetermined sites.

**Susan Bassett** (William Smith College): Thank you, Joy. At William Smith, we consider the opportunity to host an NCAA championship an honor, a privilege, and for our student-athletes, an achievement. So we really go after it hard and we're very excited about it.

I want to echo what Chris said and encourage people to get involved and to host the championships and to not be intimidated. As a former swimming coach and chair of the NCAA Swimming Committee and after hosting a number of those championships, I can tell you by comparison it's a piece of cake. If you don't have that point of reference, you'll have to take my word for it. But dealing with a multiteam, multiday, multisession championship in an aquatic environment that relies on electronic equipment, two teams showing up at one time to play at one site is really a great luxury.

At William Smith, we have evaluated our facilities and feel that we can confidently host championships in lacrosse, field hockey, soccer and basketball. We feel that our facilities for those events are top-notch and that we can provide a first-class championship experience. Then from there is the commitment to hosting that comes from the top down. I'm 100 percent behind the process. So I encourage you to get involved.

**Ms. Reign:** Next, we have Walter Johnson, director of athletics at North Central College. He's coming from the perspective of hosting a number of individual-team sports, such as a track and field national championship.

**Walter Johnson** (North Central College): You all have heard me speak enough today so I'll try to be brief. We have hosted eight national track and field championships in Division III. We had the pleasure of hosting the first combined men's and women's championship. I'll point out a couple of things.

It's a lot of work but it's a lot of fun. It's really rewarding to get your community involved, not only the community at large but your campus community. You just simply need to have a whole lot of people. But the bottom line is we have felt over the years that having the opportunity to host has brought far more benefits to the department, to the college and to the student-athletes than not hosting. So from that perspective, I will say if you have the opportunity to host an individual-team championship, there's a lot that goes into it — and we can get into some of that later — but I would jump on it without question.

**Ms. Reign:** Thank you, Walter. Ed Farrington, the director of athletics at Western Connecticut State University, has been hosting the predetermined site for the women's basketball finals. Ed, just give us a brief statement and then if you could go right into the game management end of hosting.

**Ed Farrington** (Western Connecticut State University): I think that the predetermined site for women's basketball — I don't know if it's different for other things — was a real good experience for us. We initially wanted to get into it because we thought it would be a good thing for the university to be involved with. It would be good for the university's relationship within the community. It would have some ancillary benefits for the athletic department as well as the women's basketball program.

I think there are many areas — and Chris touched upon the various areas that you have to be concerned with when you host a championship, whether it's a predetermined site or whether your team is going to be in it — that you have to be concerned about.

The one thing I think is of paramount interest when you're a predetermined site is you're not hosting a championship for your own teams. That changes the perspective of everything you do. You are serving the needs and the desires of, in our case, the Final Four with women's basketball of the athletes coming from four different institutions and various parts of the country. You really are a promotor of an event and you have to take a look at it in that business sense. You're promoting an event for the athletes, the spectators that travel to your community, and your institution. That's how we tried to approach it the first and second year.

**Ms. Reign:** Thank you, Ed. Is there anything specific related to game management?

**Mr. Farrington:** I'll give you a little overview when you take a look at a predetermined site. We're fortunate at Western Connecticut. We have an outstanding facilities operation. But I think when you look at the game management, you've got to ask your team before you even decide to bid on it whether you've got the facilities staff to put this together. Whether your venue is adequate, whether your locker room facilities are adequate, whether your support staff is up to the task. You've got to have the manpower. All of those come into what you're going to do in terms of the overall running of your event.

In terms of game management, I think a lot at the Division III level depends on whether you're full-time driven or student-worker driven and what you can depend on in terms of that staffing. It also depends on whether or not your institution is going to be in session. In our case, the last two years we've been on spring break during this tournament, so it's added some extra excitement to our efforts to get student workers.

But I think the actual running of the games and whatnot are no different than when you put on a conference tournament or an invitational tournament. As I said, the main difference is that you've got people who have different expectations and different demands. You want to make sure that you can take care of all of them to make their experience the best possible.

**Ms. Reign:** Susan, why don't you talk to us a little bit about staffing and the championship facility itself.

**Susan Bassett** (William Smith College): This is an all-hands-on-deck proposition for our department. Everyone who is not coaching is expected to staff the event. For championships, we staff primary areas with full-time support staff. That would include secretaries, equipment managers, head coaches from other sports and assistant coaches. When we hosted the field hockey final four a couple of years ago, we actually solicited volunteers from across campus. We had people from development working the game, people from the dean's office. A lot of people got excited and got involved. We would prefer to be overstaffed than understaffed. I'd rather see people standing around looking like they don't have anything to do rather than to be scrambling around feeling like we were unprepared.

As for areas that need covering, I'm just going to highlight a few. The material that's provided by the NCAA is very complete. It gives you a big checklist to cover and makes you aware that there's a lot of resources available. We staff security for crowd control. I actually will have a security officer from our staff come to the game in uniform. We staff ticket areas, we have team hosts, merchandise areas, parking, the scorer's table, announcers, all of that was mentioned previously.

We try to have the event staff dress nicely, look appropriate, no jeans. We want them to be identifiable to people. We make everything as neutral as possible so that they understand that they're not working a William Smith event, they're working an NCAA event. We have event staff jackets that are just windbreakers that can go on over their coats.

In terms of preparation of the staff, we diagram everything out. We have a meeting prior to the championship. We go over the time line. We make sure that everyone knows what their responsibilities are, where they have to be and when. If somebody's working a long shift, do we need to feed them? Do we need to have people move around? At that meeting prior to the championship, I give kind of a pep talk and I help to explain to them that this is a chance to showcase our campus, our community, and that we have the responsibili-

ty of providing an excellent experience for all the participants.

We also make sure that we have a good communication system in place through the event. That usually requires two-way radios. Key staff managers in key locations have those so we can be in touch with each other and deal with issues as they arise. The staffing provides the structure for your event management, but it's unique to your situation, it's unique to the sport and it's unique to your sports venue.

Let me just touch on a few of the facility concerns. Just to start, you really need to evaluate whether or not your facility is appropriate to host a championship. There's also a lot of things that you can do to make temporary arrangements to really dress up what in the regular season is a very plain situation. So heading into the championships, you need to evaluate the condition, thoroughly prepare everything, clean everything. I go over it all with a fine-tooth comb. I am involved in all aspects of that. Again, we neutralize our facility as much as possible. On the scoreboard where it might say "William Smith and Guest," we have name plaques made for each of the participating teams. Between games we put those plaques up so that everybody feels that this is their venue, their championship as well.

It's important at the end of a season to review the condition of all of your equipment. Are the nets intact? Has everything come through the season in good shape and prepared for the event? The worst thing that can happen is when you get to the morning of the game and the officials arrive and they go around and they find a problem and you're troubleshooting at the last minute. I suggest that you really look at everything carefully ahead of time. Look at your secondary facilities, sports medicine facilities, sports information facilities. You need to have a backup game field as well as practice facilities. It's been our experience that we need to be as prepared as possible for inclement weather both in the spring and fall. If the goal area should be tarped, who's going to do that, when is it done, who takes them off? People need to be available to make sure that your game-playing surface is as good as it's going to be.

When I talk about dressing up the facility, our field hockey and soccer facilities do not have press boxes. They do not have concession areas. So we create all of that by renting tents. We actually have a lot of fun with that because it creates a nice festival atmosphere. I put flowers wherever we can put them. We run out and buy mums to put in front of the scorer's table. We do as much as we can to dress up all of our different venues.

**Ms. Reign:** Thanks, Susan. One of the things that's always good to do is to try to get community involvement. With a nonpredetermined site, it's a little difficult. With a predetermined site, we've all done a great job. Take a few minutes and involve the community.

**Walter Johnson** (North Central College): If you don't mind, I'm going to blend a couple of areas I was going to talk about so I can condense it. In terms of community involvement and promotion, I'm going to try to go through what I think are a couple of key points if

you are hosting an individual championship at a predetermined site. We know a year in advance that we're going to host the national championships. The first thing you need to do is a little bit of homework. You need to contact your local convention and business bureau or the Chamber of Commerce. If you don't have it locally, contact the state or county office. You want to find out what the average amount of money a visitor to your community actually spends, or a visitor to your state spends.

The next thing you want to do is project the number of athletes, coaches, parents, family members and visitors that might attend the championship that you're going to host. Then you do some calculation of those two, which will give you the projected numbers in terms of the economic impact it will have on your community.

In our particular case, we were able to estimate — and came very close to that estimate — that it would have a \$6.5 million impact on our community with that particular championship. That's the story that we sold. That's what we went out to the community with and that's what got people excited because they realized if they volunteered to help this effort, it in fact was helping their community in terms of tax and general revenue.

The next thing we do is develop a championships community relationship committee. That is a combination of different people. It includes members of service clubs, city governors to help with logistics, people from the hospitals, doctors, therapists, etc., because you're going to need those folks for the drug-testing staff and massages and things like that. You want to contact your local merchants association, potential host hotels because they like the fact that you're going to have people staying there a long time.

Members of the campus community are really key. Alumni relations is a big, big area. You want to get notices out to them and get them involved. It's a great way to have your president have contact with people who may not come back to your campus for any other reason other than you are hosting something big and get that information out to them. Also, we get involved with a local printer. We get involved with our SID and local school board members. Roughly 15 people are on this community championships relationships committee. They then have different responsibilities for drumming up volunteers, doing portions of promotion, which leads me into really kind of the next big thing that we do.

With this community relations committee, we meet once every other month for the first eight months. We meet once a month for the next two, then the final two months we meet once every two weeks. The excitement starts to build a little. It gives us a chance to keep in touch with these people, to find out what they're doing. It gives us a work force somewhere in the neighborhood of 500 people because we started early on and kept them involved throughout the whole year, so they're really sold on the whole idea.

The next, and I would say the most crucial person to have

involved in this process, could be your biggest promotor, because this person has the largest number of contacts. This could be your biggest supporter because this person has influence in a lot of places that maybe you can't get to. I would say this is the very first thing you should do if you're going to host any championship — get into your president's office and sell, sell, sell your president.

**Ms. Reign:** Thanks, Walter. Ed, if you would just wrap up some of the important things about your staff.

**Ed Farrington** (Western Connecticut State University): We do a couple of things. We reach out to many in the same fashion that Walter does with community groups and exchange clubs. We have a tourism board in the greater Danbury area that's actively involved. They're very helpful with advertising and signage in buses, etc.

Danbury's a small city of about 75 to 80,000. One of the things that I think is really a signature event of our tournament is the teams typically are going to begin Wednesday afternoon or evening. Prior to their first practice time on Thursday, we have what we call an open practice and an autograph signing session for area kids. The first year we had approximately 175 to 200 kids who came. Last year, we were just slightly over 800. This year, we think we'll probably have somewhere around 1,000.

And basically, with the support of the coordinator for health and physical education in the city school system, as well as some of the area school districts around, we bus the kids in. For them it's a field trip. We bring them in at 7:30 in the morning. We schedule the teams to come in at two teams apiece for about 45 minutes to an hour. It is an interactive session. I think you can do it with women's and men's sports.

In the two years we've done this with the women's basketball teams, we've videotaped this every year. It's just the greatest event to watch 700 or 800 kids. They come down on the floor. The women on the teams will bring them in on the drills. The teams start having the kids sing the various songs that are part of what they are as a team. We finish it up with an autograph signing session where we get posters from the NCAA and we sign them.

Typically, we hope to be able to voucher some of those school kids who come back to the games and bring their parents. The end result, of course, is that we drum up some business for tickets. But for the event itself, the women on the teams that we've had the last two years have just embraced this event. It's just been a tremendous thing for us to have.

On Saturday this past year, the NCAA brought in a YES clinic. We won't have time to go into that, but that's a completely different ball of wax and different endeavor. But when you're working on community support with a championship and it's a predetermined site and then you have a YES clinic, you then have got a start to begin to reach out to other agencies. If you do a YES clinic, you want to bring in 300, 400 or 500 youngsters as part of that. That's a different effort



that is an add-on to the tournament and it really enhances it. It also makes the challenge of doing the tournament that much larger.

**Ms. Reighn:** Thanks, Ed. I'd like to thank the panelists for the time they've given us today and those of you who've stayed. (Applause.)

## ELECTIONS

**Ms. Die:** We have about three minute's worth of business yet and there's a little voting. I will move it quickly. Please stay with us. Our thanks to the panelists for leading us through these very complicated and important issues. The quality of the championships experience directly affects the welfare of our student-athletes. For this reason, championships have received high priority in the strategic plan and in the related allocation of our division's budget resources. The issues that have been identified here this afternoon cannot be ignored in that equation. I encourage all of you to support the Championships Committee in its effort to deal with these topics.

Our next item of business involves the election of our new Management Council members. You'll recall that under our new governance structure, the Nominating Committee initially selects Management Council nominations. The Management Council and the Presidents Council then review those nominations. But the positions ultimately are filled by a vote of our membership during our annual business session.

We have four appointments to make and an additional appointment to report. To present the official slate of nominees, I'm happy to introduce Valerie Cushman, director of athletics at Randolph-Macon Woman's College and chair of the Nominating Committee.

**Valerie Cushman** (Randolph-Macon Woman's College): On behalf of the Nominating Committee, I move for election of four new representatives and one reappointment to the Division III Management Council. This slate of candidates was approved by the Management Council and Presidents Council at the October 2000 meeting and by the Administrative Committee and is now presented to the Division III membership for election. The slate of candidates is: Stephen Argo, commissioner, Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference; Suzanne Coffey, director of athletics, Bates College and the New England Small College Athletic Conference; John Harper, director of athletics, Bridgewater State University and the Massachusetts State Athletic Conference; Karen Johnson for reappointment, faculty athletics representative, Alfred University in the Empire Eight Conference; finally, Leon Lunder, director of athletics, Carleton College and the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. Also, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee appointed Amy Ashbrock, student-athlete, Wilmington College (Ohio), as their representative to the Management Council.

**Ms. Die:** Thank you, Val. Are there other nominations from the floor? There being no nominees from the floor, all those in favor of the

slate, please raise your paddles. All opposed, raise your paddles. Abstentions. Congratulations to our new Management Council members. (Applause.) We look forward to working with each of them.

I also want to remind our delegates of new appointments to the Presidents Council. As you may remember, members of that body are appointed by vote of the Division III CEOs. New members are John McCardell, president, Middlebury College; and John Roush, president, Centre College. We welcome them to the Presidents Council.

I remind you to leave your paddles and your voting units at your place. I thank you for your attention. You all received badges for being committed to Division III. I declare this meeting adjourned. (Applause.)

[The Division III business session was duly adjourned at 5:51 p.m.]

# 95th Annual Convention

## LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

### SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP

[Note: Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.13, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption at the NCAA Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date prior to the first day of August, a two-thirds majority of all delegates present and eligible to vote on the amendment is required to approve the immediate or alternative effective date. Those proposals that were submitted with an immediate effective date are noted with an asterisk (\*) by the effective date. Those proposals that receive the required vote to carry an immediate effective date and that are adopted, become effective upon adjournment of the Convention.]

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 2000-01 NCAA Divisions II and III Manuals.] All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments upon which the 95th annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments-to-amendments immediately follow the proposal to which they relate.*

#### TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 95th ANNUAL CONVENTION

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
<b>1 through 45</b>	<b>Division II Legislative Proposals</b>
1 through 9	Consent Package
10 through 30	President Council Grouping
31	Amateurism
32 through 33	Recruiting
34 through 38	Eligibility
39	Financial Aid
40	Awards and Benefits
41 through 45	General
<b>46 through 77</b>	<b>Division III Legislative Proposals</b>
46 through 54	Presidents Council Grouping
55 through 63	General
64 through 77	Deregulation Package

## DIVISION II LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

*The NCAA Division II Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division II athletics that prompt wide-spread concern among Division II chief executive officers.*

*Legislative proposals developed by the Division II Management Council or by Division II committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division II Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division II.*

*The Division II Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division II chief executive officers and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division II Presidents Council for or against a proposal. The only proposals officially sponsored by the Presidents Council are those identified with an asterisk before the proposal number. All proposals in the Presidents Council grouping may be subject to a roll-call vote.*

---

### CONSENT PACKAGE

#### **NO. 1 (NO. 2-6) ELIGIBILITY – RESTITUTION FOR RECEIPT OF IMPROPER BENEFIT**

**Intent:** To increase from \$25 to \$50 the dollar limit for which an institution does not have to declare an individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) ineligible and seek reinstatement when the individual receives an improper benefit, provided the individual repays the value of the improper benefit.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.2.1, page 79, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.2.1 General Regulation. An institution's staff member or any representative of its athletics interests shall not be involved, directly or indirectly, in making arrangements for or giving or offering to give any financial aid or other benefits to the prospect or the prospect's relatives or friends, other than expressly permitted by NCAA regulations. This prohibition shall apply regardless of whether similar financial aid, benefits or arrangements are available to prospective students in general, their relatives or friends. For violations of this bylaw in which the value of the offer or inducement is \$25 **50** or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled

student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff with the institution's self-report of the violation."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.2.2.1, pages 79-80, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.2.2.1 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 13.2.2 in which the value of the offer or inducement is \$25 **50** or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff with the institution's self-report of the violation."

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 13.6.1, page 82, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.6.1 General Restrictions. An institution may not provide transportation to a prospect other than on the official paid visit or, on an unofficial visit, to view a practice or competition site and other institutional facilities (located within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus) when accompanied by an institutional staff member. However, an institution may not provide transportation to attend one of the institution's home contests (on or off campus) during the unofficial visit. For violations of this bylaw in which the value of the offer or inducement is \$25 **50** or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff with the institution's self-report of the violation."

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 13.6.2.9, page 83, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.6.2.9 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 13.6.2 in which the value of the transportation is \$25 **50** or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected

conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff with the institution's self-report of the violation."

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 13.7.5.1, page 85, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.7.5.1 General Restrictions. An institution may provide entertainment, which may not be excessive, on the official visit only for a prospect and the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse and only within a 30-mile radius of the institution's main campus. Entertainment and contact by representatives of the institution's athletics interests during the official visit are prohibited in Division I and confined to campus in Division II. It is not permissible to entertain other relatives or friends (including dates) of a prospect at any time at any site. For violations of this bylaw in which the value of the entertainment is \$25 **50** or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff with the institution's self-report of the violation."

**F. Bylaws:** Amend 13.7.5.2, page 85, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.7.5.2 Complimentary Admissions. During the official visit, complimentary admissions to a campus athletics event may be provided only to a prospect and the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse. In Division I, such admissions may provide seating only in the general seating area of the facility utilized for conducting the event. Providing seating during the conduct of the event (including intermission) for the prospect or the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse in the facility's press box, special seating box(es) or bench area is specifically prohibited. For violations of this bylaw in which the individual receives an excessive number of complimentary admissions, and the value of the excessive admissions is \$25 **50** or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff with the institution's self-report of the violation."

**G. Bylaws:** Amend 13.7.5.5.1, page 86, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.7.5.5.1 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 13.7.5.5 in which the value of the benefit to the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) is \$25 **50** or less, the eligibility of the individual shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff with the institution's self-report of the violation."

**H. Bylaws:** Amend 13.7.5.7.2, page 87, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.7.5.7.2 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 13.7.5.7.1 in which the value of the excessive meals is \$25 **50** or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff with the institution's self-report of the violation."

**I. Bylaws:** Amend 13.8.2.7, page 88, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.8.2.7 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 13.8.2 in which the value of the entertainment/tickets/meal is \$25 **50** or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff with the institution's self-report of the violation."

**J. Bylaws:** Amend 16.4.2.1, page 165, as follows:

[Division II]

"16.4.2.1 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 16.4.2 in which the value of the benefit is \$25 **50** or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned upon the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of

the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

**K. Bylaws:** Amend 16.6.2.5, page 167, as follows:

[Division II]

"16.6.2.5 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 16.6.2 in which the value of the benefit received by a student-athlete's friend or relative is \$25 **50** or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned upon the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

**L. Bylaws:** Amend 16.8.2.5, pages 170-171, as follows:

[Division II]

"16.8.2.5 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 16.8.2 in which the value of the benefit is \$25 **50** or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned upon the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

**M. Bylaws:** Amend 16.10.2.8, page 172, as follows:

[Division II]

"16.10.2.8 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 16.10.2 in which the value of the benefit is \$25 **50** or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned upon the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

**N. Bylaws:** Amend 16.11.2.7, page 174, as follows:

[Division II]

"16.11.2.7 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 16.11.2 in which the value of the benefit is \$25 **50** or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned upon the student-athlete repaying the value of



the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

- O. Bylaws:** Amend 16.12.2.10, page 176, as follows:  
[Division II]

"16.12.2.10 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 16.12.2 in which the value of the benefit is \$25 ~~50~~ or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned upon the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** Immediately.\*

**Rationale:** Over the past three years, the NCAA membership has enacted legislation whereby an institution does not have to declare an individual (prospective student athlete or student-athlete) ineligible and seek reinstatement as a result of receipt of prescribed extra benefits subject to a certain value restriction. Pursuant to this legislation, the individual is required only to repay the value of the benefit in order to regain eligible status. Given the success of this process, it makes sense to increase the dollar limit from \$25 to \$50 or less. This proposal will decrease the number of situations that must be reviewed by the NCAA's Student-Athlete Reinstatement staff while at the same time not increasing the potential for abuse.

**Action:** Adopted, effective immediately.

<b>NO. 2 (NO. 2-7)</b>	<b>RECRUITING – ENTERTAINMENT ON OFFICIAL VISITS — RESTITUTION FOR RECEIPT OF IMPROPER BENEFITS</b>
------------------------	---

**Intent:** To specify that an institution does not have to declare a student-athlete ineligible and seek reinstatement for violations of Bylaw 13.7.6 when a student-athlete received an improper benefit, provided the student-athlete repays the value of the improper benefit.

- Bylaws:** Amend 13.7.6, page 87, as follows:  
[Division II]

"13.7.6 Entertainment on Official Visit for Spouse, Parent or Legal Guardian of Prospect. A member institution shall limit entertainment, meals and lodging on the prospect's official visit to a prospect,

the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] and spouse. **For violations of this bylaw, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned on the individual repaying the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time that the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."**

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Bylaw 13.7.5.1 (general restriction) and Bylaw 13.7.6 (entertainment on an official visit for spouse, parent or legal guardian of prospect) place limits on entertainment that may be provided to a prospective student-athlete on an official visit. Violations of Bylaw 13.7.5.1 do not require restitution, while violations of Bylaw 13.7.6 do. Thus, making Bylaw 13.7.6 a "restitution violation" will simplify the process, provide consistency and equity.

**Action:** Adopted.

### **NO. 3 (NO. 2-10) RECRUITING – CAMPS/CONFERENCES – ATHLETES IN ACTION**

**Intent:** To specify that camps, clinics and conferences conducted by Athletes in Action shall be exempt from NCAA restrictions on camps and clinics.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.13.3, page 95, as follows:  
[Division II]

"13.13.3 FCA **and AIA** Camps and Conferences, NYSP and YES Clinics. Camps, clinics and conferences conducted by the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, **Athletes in Action** or as part of the National Youth Sports Program (NYSP) and Youth Education through Sports (YES) program are exempt from NCAA restrictions on camps and clinics."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 16.11.1.3, page 173, as follows:  
[Division II]

"16.11.1.3 FCA/AIA Encampments. Nationally recognized service organizations and church groups (including the Fellowship of Christian Athletes **and Athletes in Action**) may underwrite the actual and necessary expenses of student-athletes attending Fellowship of Christian Athletes **or Athletes in Action** encampments. Neither the institution nor an athletically related organization may underwrite such expenses."

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The mission, goals and activities of Athletes in Action (AIA) are substantially similar to those of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes (FCA). Thus, it is appropriate that AIA should receive the same exceptions applicable to the FCA as it relates to the attendance of NCAA coaches at such camps or conferences as well as expenses to student-athletes to attend AIA encampments. It should be noted that such an exception is not applicable to foreign tours and international competition conducted by AIA.

**Action:** Adopted.

#### **NO. 4 (NO. 2-11) RECRUITING – HIGH-SCHOOL ALL-STAR GAMES**

**Intent:** To permit coaches to coach a high-school all-star game when previous contractual agreements exist.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.14.1.1, page 96, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.14.1.1 Previous Contractual Agreement. If a coach has made a contractual commitment to coach in a high-school all-star game before being employed by a member institution and then becomes a member of the institution's coaching staff before the all-star game is held, the coach shall be *obligated to observe this provision and disassociate himself or herself from the all-star game* **permitted to honor the contract provided participation in the all-star contest occurs prior to the coach commencing employment with the member institution.**"

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Situations such as this are rare and individuals should not be prohibited from coaching an all-star contest because they subsequently accept employment at a Division II institution. Such involvement with an all-star game once the individual's employment commences at the Division II institution would still be prohibited.

**Action:** Adopted.

#### **NO. 5 (NO. 2-12) DE MINIMIS VIOLATIONS**

**Intent:** To specify instances in which a de minimis violation will not render a prospective student-athlete ineligible while retaining the fact that such a violation shall be considered an institutional violation.

- A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.16.1.2, page 97, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.16.1.2 Fund Raising for High-School Athletics Program. An institution may not provide funding, directly or through paid advertisements, to benefit a high-school athletics program. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, the violation shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility.**"

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.13.2.1.2 by adding new 13.13.2.1.2.1, page 95, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.13.2.1.2 Employment in Own Institution's Camp or Clinic. A member institution (or employees of its athletics department) may employ its student-athletes as counselors in camps or clinics, subject to the following conditions:

"(a) The student-athlete shall not participate in organized practice activities other than during the institution's playing season in the sport (see Bylaw 17.1.1); and

"(b) The member institution's director of athletics must give prior approval to the student-athlete's employment arrangement.

**"13.13.2.1.2.1 Effect of Violations. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, the violation shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility."**

- C. Bylaws:** Amend 13.16.1.5.1, page 97, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.16.1.5.1 Athletics Equipment. A member institution may not provide athletics equipment to a high school. However, a member institution is permitted to provide athletics equipment to bona fide youth organizations (e.g., the YMCA, a boy scout troop, a summer recreation league) that may consist of some prospects, provided the issuance of equipment is in accordance with the institution's regular policy regarding the discarding of equipment. Further, only those organizations within a 30-mile radius of the campus may be provided such equipment by the institution. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, the violation shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility.**"

- D. Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.7.1.1 by adding new 15.2.7.1.1.1, page 147, as follows:

[Division II]

"15.2.7.1.1 The following conditions apply to the awarding of financial aid to a student-athlete to attend an institution in the summer before the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment:

"(a) The recipient shall be admitted to the awarding member institution in accordance with regular, published entrance requirements;

- "(b) The recipient, if recruited, is subject to NCAA transfer provisions per Bylaw 14.5.2-(h);
- "(c) During the summer term or orientation period, the recipient shall not engage in any organized athletics practice activities (see Bylaw 17.02.1.1); and
- "(d) The awarding institution certifies in writing that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability. The written certification shall be on file in the office of the director of athletics and shall be signed by the faculty athletics representative and the director of financial aid.

**"15.2.7.1.1.1 Effect of Violations. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, the violation shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility."**

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

**Effective Date:** Immediately.\*

**Rationale:** This proposal is similar to those adopted at recent Conventions and represents an attempt to decrease the number of circumstances in which an institution is required to declare a student-athlete ineligible as a result of a violation where the student-athlete did not receive a benefit and little or no recruiting or competitive advantage occurred.

**Action:** Adopted, effective immediately.

## **NO. 6 (NO. 2-13) 10-SEMESTER/15-QUARTER EXTENSION REQUEST - ELIGIBILITY FOR PRACTICE**

**Intent:** To permit a student-athlete who has exhausted his or her 10-semester/15-quarters of eligibility to practice, but not compete, for 30 consecutive-calendar days provided the institution has filed a 10-semester/15-quarter extension request per NCAA Bylaw 30.6.1 with the NCAA national office.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.2.3 by adding new 14.2.3.6, page 110, as follows:  
[Division II]

[14.2.3.1 through 14.2.3.5 unchanged.]

**"14.2.3.6 10-Semester/15-Quarter Extension Request. A student-athlete, who has exhausted his or her 10-semester/15-quarter period of eligibility, may practice, but not compete, for 30 consecutive-calendar days, provided the institution has filed a 10-semester/15-quarter extension request per Bylaw 30.6.1 with the NCAA national office."**

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Permitting the student-athlete to practice for a maximum of 30 consecutive-calendar days will ensure that in those instances in which the extension request is granted, the student-athlete would be prepared to engage in physical competition and would be less susceptible to injury. This legislation is designed with student-athletes' welfare in mind.

**Action:** Adopted.

#### **NO. 7 (NO. 2-19) ELIGIBILITY – COLLEGIATE ALL-STAR CONTESTS**

**Intent:** To preclude student-athletes with eligibility remaining from participating in collegiate all-star contests in all sports.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.7.6, page 132, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.7.6 Collegiate All-Star Contests. A student-athlete who competes as a member of a squad in any college all-star *football or basketball* contest shall be denied further intercollegiate eligibility in that sport."

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** This amendment will make the prohibition against participation in collegiate all-star contests consistent for all sports. The current rule only applies to football and basketball.

**Action:** Adopted.

#### **NO. 8 (NO. 2-36) ELIGIBILITY – RESTITUTION FOR RECEIPT OF IMPROPER BENEFITS**

**Intent:** To specify instances in which a de minimis violation of Bylaw 16 will not render an enrolled student-athlete ineligible while retaining the fact that such a violation shall be considered an institutional violation.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 16.1 by adding new 16.1.8, page 163, as follows:

[Division II]

[16.1.1 through 16.1.7 unchanged.]

**"16.1.8 Eligibility Ramifications – Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits.** For violations of Bylaw 16.1 in which the value of the benefit is \$50 or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned on the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the

**benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1 and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."**

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 16.2 by adding new 16.2.3, pages 163-164, as follows:

[Division II]

[16.2.1 and 16.2.2 unchanged.]

**"16.2.3 Eligibility Ramification – Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits.** For violations of Bylaw 16.2 in which the value of the benefit is \$50 or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned on the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1 and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

- C. Bylaws:** Amend 16.3 by adding new 16.3.3, pages 163-164, as follows:

[Division II]

[16.3.1 and 16.3.2 unchanged.]

**"16.3.3 Eligibility Ramification – Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits.** For violations of Bylaw 16.3 in which the value of the benefit is \$50 or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned on the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1 and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

- D. Bylaws:** Amend 16.5 by adding new 16.5.3, page 166, as follows:

[Division II]

[16.5.1 and 16.5.2 unchanged.]

**"16.5.3 Eligibility Ramification – Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits.** For violations of Bylaw 16.5 in which the value of the benefit is \$50 or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned on the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of

the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1 and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

- E. **Bylaws:** Amend 16.7 by adding new 16.7.5, page 168, as follows:

[Division II]

[16.7.1 through 16.7.4 unchanged.]

**"16.7.5 Eligibility Ramification – Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits.** For violations of Bylaw 16.7 in which the value of the benefit is \$50 or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned on the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1 and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

- F. **Bylaws:** Amend 16.9 by adding new 16.9.4, page 171, as follows:

[Division II]

[16.9.1 through 16.9.3 unchanged.]

**"16.9.4 Eligibility Ramification – Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits.** For violations of Bylaw 16.9 in which the value of the benefit is \$50 or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned on the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1 and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** This proposal eliminates the requirement that institutions declare student-athlete's ineligible and seek reinstatement of eligibility through the reinstatement process for violations in which the student-athlete received a benefit of \$50 or less. The student-athlete must repay the value of the benefit in order to regain his or her eligibility. The student-athlete remains ineligible for competition until the repayment has been documented by the



institution. Further, extending the bylaw will eliminate confusion regarding which violations within Bylaw 16 are restitution violations.

**Action:** Adopted, effective immediately.

#### **NO. 9 (NO. 2-38) PERMISSIBLE BENEFITS – POSTSEASON EVENTS**

**Intent:** To permit institutions to secure or reserve lodging at postseason events at a reduced or special rate for the parents (or legal guardians) and relatives of student-athletes participating in the event.

**Bylaws:** Amend 16.6.1 by adding new 16.6.1.3, pages 166-167, as follows:

[Division II]

[16.6.1.1 and 16.6.1.2 unchanged.]

**"16.6.1.3 Family Lodging at Postseason Events. An institution may reserve or secure lodging at any postseason event other than a conference event at a reduced or special rate for the parents (or legal guardians) and immediate family members of a student-athlete who is a participant in the postseason event. It is not permissible for an institution to pay for any portion of the cost of lodging, including any cost associated with reserving or securing lodging."**

[16.6.1.3 through 16.6.1.5 renumbered as 16.6.1.4 through 16.6.1.6 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** Immediately.\*

**Rationale:** The opportunity to participate in a postseason event (other than a conference event) such as a championship or a bowl game is a significant experience in the life of a student-athlete and his or her family. Due to the special nature of such events, it is common that the parents and/or immediate family of student-athletes attend such events to provide support for their son or daughter. In many instances, increased interest from the general public related to a postseason event results in parents and immediate family of student-athletes encountering difficulty in obtaining convenient lodging in the locale in which the event is being conducted. This proposal will address such concerns by permitting institutions participating in such postseason events to secure or reserve lodging at special or reduced rates for the parents (or legal guardians) and immediate family of student-athletes participating in the postseason event, thereby ensuring that the student-athlete's family will have the opportunity to be part of the event.

**Action:** Adopted, effective immediately.

---

## PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

### **\*NO. 10 (NO. 2-1)      LEGISLATIVE PROCESS - AMENDMENT-TO-AMENDMENT REQUIREMENTS**

**Intent:** To specify that amendment-to-amendments may be sponsored by one conference or eight active member institutions.

**Bylaws:** Amend 5.3.4.2, page 36, as follows:

[Division II]

"5.3.4.2 Amendment-to-Amendment. An amendment to an amendment of a provision of the bylaws may be sponsored by:

"(a) The Presidents Council;

"(b) *Fifteen* **Eight** or more active member institutions with voting privileges on written verification of sponsorship signed by each sponsoring member's chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative;

"(c) At least *two* **one** member conferences with voting privileges when submitted by the chief elected or executive officer of the conferences on behalf of 15 or more of their active member institutions and signed by the chairs of the conferences's official presidential administrative groups or at least two chief executive officers of a conference's member institutions if a conference has no presidential administrative group.

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Management Council).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Currently, due to sponsorship requirements for an amendment-to-amendment, it is difficult for a conference (or group of institutions) to secure "co-sponsorship" between the time the Initial Publication of Proposed Legislation is published and the amendment-to-amendment deadline. In many instances, such proposals likely would improve the original proposal or address issues the sponsor of the original proposal may have overlooked. This change would simplify the amendment-to amendment requirements while retaining the requirements to sponsor an original change in legislation.

**Action:** Adopted.

### **\*NO. 11 (NO. 2-2)      LEGISLATIVE PROCESS - PROPOSALS SPONSORED BY PRESIDENTS COUNCIL**

**Intent:** To give the Presidents Council authority to waive the September 1 Presidents Council sponsorship deadline as specified.

**Bylaws:** Amend 5.3.5.3.1.2 by adding new 5.3.5.3.1.2.1, pages 37-38, renumbering subsequent section, as follows:

[Division II]

[5.3.5.3.1.2 unchanged.]

**"5.3.5.3.1.2.1 Exception – Annual Convention. The Presidents Council, by a three-fourths majority of its member present and voting, may submit amendments subsequent to September 1 when necessitated by action taken by Division I or Division III. In such instances, the Presidents Council shall submit amendments not later than November 1."**

[5.3.5.3.1.2.1 renumbered as 5.3.5.3.1.2.2, unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Management Council).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Members of the Presidents Council believe that this much needed authority would permit the Presidents Council to sponsor legislation as a result of action taken by Division I or Division III between the current September 1 deadline and November 1, when such action would have a direct impact on the Division II membership. A November 1 deadline for such proposals would provide time to notify the membership of such additional proposals prior to the Convention.

**Action:** Adopted.

**\*NO. 12 (NO. 2-3)**

**AMATEURISM – ACTIVITIES PRIOR TO INITIAL ENROLLMENT**

**Intent:** To permit individuals to participate in certain activities prior to initial collegiate enrollment without jeopardizing eligibility and to specify that an individual may be charged with a season(s) of competition during each calendar year of participation in outside competition subsequent to high school graduation and prior to initial collegiate enrollment.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 12.1.1, pages 58-59, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"12.1.1 Amateur Status. An individual loses amateur status and thus shall not be eligible for intercollegiate competition in a particular sport if the individual:

"(a) **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment,** Uses his or her athletics skill (directly or indirectly) for pay in any form in that sport;

"(b) **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment,** Accepts a promise of pay even if such pay is to be received following completion of intercollegiate athletics participation;

- "(c) **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment,** Ssigns a contract or commitment of any kind to play professional athletics, regardless of its legal enforceability or any consideration received;
- "(d) **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment,** Rreceives, directly or indirectly, a salary, reimbursement of expenses or any other form of financial assistance from a professional sports organization based on athletics skill or participation, except as permitted by NCAA rules and regulations;
- "(e) **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment,** Ccompetes on any professional athletics team and knows (or had reason to know) that the team is a professional athletics team (per Bylaw 12.02.4), even if no pay or remuneration for expenses was received; *or*
- "(f) **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment,** Eenters into a professional draft or an agreement with an agent (see also Bylaw 12.2.4.2.1); **or**
- "(g) **Enters into an agreement with an agent either prior to or subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment.**  
 "12.1.1.1 Prohibited Forms of Pay. **The prohibition against "Ppay" as used in Bylaw 12.1.1 above is applicable only to individuals subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment and includes, but is not limited to, the following:**  
     [12.1.1.1.1 through 12.1.1.1.3 unchanged.]  
     "12.1.1.1.4.1 Cash or Equivalent Award. **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment,** Ccash, or the equivalent thereof (e.g., trust fund), as an award for participation in competition at any time, even if such an award is permitted under the rules governing an amateur, noncollegiate event in which the individual is participating. An award or a cash prize that an individual could not receive under NCAA legislation may not be forwarded in the individual's name to a different individual or agency.  
     [12.1.1.1.4.2 through 12.1.1.1.4.6 unchanged.]  
     "12.1.1.1.5 Payment Based on Performance. **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment,** Aany payment, including actual and necessary expenses, conditioned on the individual's or team's place finish or performance or given on an incentive basis, or receipt of expenses in excess of the same reasonable amount for permissible expenses given to all individuals or team members involved in the competition.  
     [12.1.1.1.6 through 12.1.1.1.7 unchanged.]  
     "12.1.1.2 Use of Overall Athletics Skill-Effect on Eligibility. **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment,** Pparticipation for pay in competition that involves the use of overall athletics skill (e.g., "superstars" competition) constitutes a violation of the Association's amateur-status regulations; therefore, an individual participating for pay in such competition is ineligible for intercollegiate

competition in all sports. (See Bylaw 12.5.2.3.3 for exception related to promotional contests.)

"12.1.1.3 Road Racing. "Road racing" is essentially the same as cross country or track and field competition and cannot be separated effectively from those sports for purposes of Bylaw 12. Therefore, **subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment** an *student-athlete individual* who accepts pay in any form for participation in such a race is ineligible for intercollegiate cross country or track and field competition."

[12.1.1.4 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 12.2, pages 61-62, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"12.2.1 Tryouts.

*"12.2.1.1 Tryout Prior to Enrollment. A student-athlete remains eligible in a sport even though, prior to enrollment in a collegiate institution, the student-athlete may have tried out with a professional athletics team in a sport or received not more than one expense-paid visit from each professional team (or a combine including that team), provided such a visit did not exceed 48 hours and any payment or compensation in connection with the visit was not in excess of actual and necessary expenses. A self-financed tryout may be for any length of time.*

[12.2.1.2 through 12.2.1.4 renumbered as 12.2.1.1 through 12.2.1.3, unchanged.]

"12.2.2 Practice Without Competition. **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment**, *Aan* individual may participate in practice sessions conducted by a professional team, provided such participation meets the requirements of NCAA legislation governing tryouts with professional athletics teams (see 12.2.1) and the individual does not:

"12.2.3 Competition.

[12.2.3.1 unchanged.]

"12.2.3.2 Competition with Professionals. **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment**, *Aan* individual shall not be eligible for intercollegiate athletics in a sport if the individual ever participated on a team and knew (or had reason to know) that the team was a professional team (per 12.02.4) in that sport. However, an individual may compete on a tennis, golf, two-person sand volleyball or two-person synchronized diving teams with persons who are competing for cash or a comparable prize, provided the individual does not receive payment of any kind for such participation.

"12.2.3.2.1 Professional Player as Team Member. **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment**, *Aan* individual may participate with a professional on a team, provided the professional is not being paid by a professional

team or league to play as a member of that team (e.g., summer basketball leagues with teams composed of both professional and amateur athletes).

[12.2.3.2.2 unchanged.]

"12.2.3.2.3 Amateur/Professional Leagues. **Subsequent to initial full-time enrollment**, Aan individual may participate as a member of an amateur team in a league in which one or more teams are professional, provided the league is not a member of a recognized professional sports organization or is not directly supported or sponsored by a professional sports team or organization.

[12.2.3.3 unchanged.]

"12.2.4 Draft and Inquiry.

[12.2.4.1 unchanged.]

"12.2.4.2 Draft List. **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment**, Aan individual loses amateur status in a particular sport when the individual asks to be placed on the draft list or supplemental draft list of a professional league in that sport, even though:

[12.2.4.3 unchanged.]

"12.2.5 Contracts and Compensation.

"12.2.5.1 General Rule. **Subsequent to initial full-time collegiate enrollment**, Aan individual shall be ineligible for participation in an intercollegiate sport if he or she has entered into any kind of agreement to compete in professional athletics, either orally or in writing, regardless of the legal enforceability of that agreement.

"12.2.5.1.1 Nonbinding Agreements. **Subsequent to initial full-time enrollment**, Aan individual who signs a contract or commitment that does not become binding until the professional organization's representative or agent also signs the document is ineligible, even if the contract remains unsigned by the other parties until after the student-athlete's eligibility is exhausted."

C. **Bylaws:** Amend 12.5.1 by adding new 12.5.1.2, pages 64-67, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

**"12.5.1.2 Participation in Commercials – Prior to Collegiate Enrollment.** Prior to initial full-time collegiate enrollment, an individual may promote or endorse commercial products or services without jeopardizing intercollegiate eligibility, provided the individual does not receive payment or any other form of compensation (other than actual and necessary expenses), if he or she is displaying athletics skill or is selected to participate in the promotion as a result of his or her athletics reputation or ability."

[12.5.1.2 renumbered as 12.5.1.2.1 unchanged.]

- D. Bylaws:** Amend 14.2.4 by adding new 14.2.4.2, page 110-111, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

[14.2.4.1 unchanged.]

**"14.2.4.2 Participation in Organized Competition Prior to Initial Collegiate Enrollment.** An individual who does not enroll in a collegiate institution as a full-time student during the regular academic term that is immediately subsequent to the date that the individual's high-school class normally graduates from high-school (or the international equivalent as specified in the NCAA Guide to International Academic Standards for Athletics Eligibility) shall utilize a season of intercollegiate competition for each calendar year or sports season (subsequent to that date) in which the individual has participated in activities that meet the criteria set forth in 14.2.4.2.2.

**"14.2.4.2.1 Academic Year in Residence.** An individual who utilizes a season(s) of competition per 14.2.4.2, shall fulfill an academic year in residence prior to being eligible to represent the institution in intercollegiate competition.

**"14.2.4.2.2 Activities Constituting Use of Season.** An individual shall utilize a season of competition per 14.2.4.2 if the individual participates in activities that meet any of the following criteria:

- "(a) Any team competition or training in which compensation is provided to any of the participants (including actual and necessary expenses);**
- "(b) Any individual competition or training in which the participant receives compensation (including actual and necessary expenses);**
- "(c) Any competition pursuant to the signing of a contract for athletics participation;**
- "(d) Any competition pursuant to involvement in a professional draft;**
- "(e) Any competition funded by a professional sports organization, excluding not-for-profit organizations affiliated with professional sports organizations;**
- "(f) Any competition funded by a representative of an institution's athletics interest that is not an open event; or**
- "(g) Any practice with a professional athletics team (excluding a 48-hour tryout).**

**"14.2.4.2.2.1 United States Armed Services Exception.** Participation in activities that meet the criteria set forth in 14.2.4.2.2 during time spent in the U.S. Armed Services shall be excepted as long as the competition is organized and administered by the military.

**"14.2.4.2.2.2 National/International Competition Exception.** For a maximum of one year, participation in activities that meet the criteria set forth in 14.2.4.2.2 shall be excepted if the competition is national or international competition that includes participation in:

**"(a) Official Pan American, World Championships, World Cup, World University and Olympic training, tryouts and competition;**

**"(b) Officially recognized training and competition directly qualifying participants for final Olympic tryouts; or**

**"(c) Official tryouts and competition involving national teams sponsored by the appropriate national governing bodies of the U.S. Olympic Committee (or, for student-athletes representing another nation, the equivalent organization of that nation, or, for student-athletes competing in a non-Olympic sport, the equivalent organization of that sport).**

**"14.2.4.2.2.3 Post-Graduate College Preparatory School.** Participation in activities that meet the criteria set forth in 14.2.4.2.2 while enrolled in a post-graduate college preparatory school shall be excepted. This exception may only be utilized during the initial year of enrollment in the preparatory school.

**"14.2.4.2.2.4 Skiing Exception.** For a maximum of two years, participation in activities that meet the criteria set forth in 14.2.4.2.2 shall be excepted in the sport of skiing when such participation is part of competition sanctioned by the United States Skiing Association and its international counterparts."

[14.2.4.2 through 14.2.4.4 renumbered as 14.2.4.3 through 14.2.4.5, unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Amateurism Project Team)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Two years ago, the Division II Amateurism Project Team began examining two interrelated issues: competitive equity and amateurism. After an intense analysis and membership input, the project team concluded that the Division II membership should consider deregulation of amateurism rules affecting preenrollment



activities and a seasons of competition rule. The project team believes these legislative modifications are necessary for several reasons. There is currently a competitive imbalance in Division II sports where student-athletes with prior competitive experience are dominating traditional student-athletes at Division II championships. Also, Division II administrators and coaches are experiencing challenges in determining whether certain prospective student-athletes are "amateur" or "professional" under current legislation. These proposals shift the focus away from classification and towards competitive experience. Finally, and potentially most importantly, student-athlete welfare is at the core of these proposals. Currently, student-athletes who demonstrate an intent to professionalize by signing a contract, entering the draft, competing with professionals or accepting limited pay for play are determined to be permanently ineligible. These proposals embrace the individual who truly desires to pursue academics while maintaining competitive equity through the application of the seasons of competition rule.

**Action:** Adopted.

#### **\*NO. 13 (NO. 2-5) RECRUITING – TELEPHONE CALLS**

**Intent:** To permit an institution to make unlimited telephone calls to prospective student-athletes subsequent to the calendar day on which the prospect signed the institution's written offer of admission or financial aid, provided that date is not prior to the initial regular signing date for the National Letter of Intent program.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.3.3.3, page 76, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.1.3.3.3 Telephone Calls Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written *Commitment* **Offer of Admission or Financial Aid.** After the calendar day on which a prospect signs a National Letter of Intent **or written offer of admission or financial aid**, there shall be no limit on the number of telephone calls by the institution with which the prospect has signed. *For an institution not utilizing the National Letter of Intent in a particular sport, there shall be no limit on the number of telephone calls to a prospect, the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) by that institution subsequent to the calendar day in which the prospect signs acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid.* **Telephone calls subsequent to a prospective student-athlete signing a written offer of admission or financial aid shall not be made prior to the initial regular (as opposed to early) signing date for the National Letter of Intent program."**

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** 2000 Convention Proposal No. 35 was intended to give institutions the same telephone call access to prospective student-athlete who did not sign National Letters of Intent as those prospects who do sign such letters. Proposal No. 35 was defeated due to concerns that it would be abused by having prospects sign admission and financial aid offers during the early periods (as opposed to regular periods) simply to enable institutions to make unlimited telephone calls. This proposal eliminates that potential abuse by specifying that unlimited phone calls subsequent to signing written offers of admission or financial aid could not occur until after the initial regular signing date for the National Letter of Intent program. If adopted, this would allow the institutions to call prospects who have signed a written offer of admission or financial aid on the same basis as they call prospects that have signed National Letters of Intent.

**Action:** Defeated, 116-133-2. Motion to reconsider defeated, 109-127.

**\*NO. 14 (NO. 2-15) INITIAL ELIGIBILITY – CORE CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS – COMPUTER SCIENCE**

**Intent:** To specify that computer science courses are not acceptable core courses in meeting initial-eligibility core-curriculum requirements.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.1.1, page 113, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.3.1.1 Qualifier. A qualifier is defined as one who is a high-school graduate and who presented the following minimum academic qualifications:

"(a) A minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 13 academic courses per Bylaw 14.3.1.2, including the following:

English	3 years
Mathematics	2 years
Natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory course if offered by the high school)	2 years
Additional courses in English, mathematics or natural or physical science	2 years
Social science	2 years
Additional academic courses [in any of the above areas or foreign language, <i>computer science</i> , philosophy or non doctrinal religion (e.g., comparative religion) courses]	2 years

The record of the above courses and course grades must be certified by the initial-eligibility clearinghouse using an official high-school transcript or official correspondence forwarded directly from the high school or on a high-school transcript forwarded by an institution's admissions office; and"

[Remainder of 14.3.1.1 unchanged].

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.1.2, page 114, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.3.1.2 Core-Curriculum Requirements. For purposes of meeting the core-curriculum requirement to establish eligibility at a Division I or II member institution, a "core course" must meet all of the following criteria:

"(a) A course must be a recognized academic course and qualify for high-school graduation credit in one or a combination of the following areas: English, mathematics, natural/physical science, social science, foreign language, *computer science* or non-doctrinal religion/philosophy;

[Remainder of 14.3.1.2 unchanged].

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academics Requirements Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2005; for students first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2005.

**Rationale:** The current core-curriculum areas were legislated in the early 1980's. At that time, computer-science courses were programming based and academic in nature. In today's secondary education environment, the vast majority of computer science courses no longer contain programming elements but teach life skills, such as the use of a desktop computer and software applications. Although these software and keyboarding skills may be beneficial to college-bound students, they are not academic in nature. Given these changes in technology and secondary-school curriculum, removing computer-science courses from the core-curriculum areas will ensure that students truly are completing 13 academic courses, which was the original intent of the legislation. It should be noted that computer courses that concentrate on the intricacies of programming using a truly academic program can be encompassed in the mathematics-curriculum requirement.

**Action:** Adopted.

**\*NO. 15 (NO. 2-21)**  
**(Dereg. No. 1)**

**FINANCIAL AID – ELIGIBILITY FOR  
FINANCIAL AID**

**Intent:** To permit an institution to grant athletically-related financial aid for a maximum of 10 semesters/15 quarters and to provide institutional financial aid after this time period at the discretion of the institution consistent with institutional policies for awarding financial aid in general.

**Bylaws:** Amend 15.01.5, pages 139-140, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.01.5 Eligibility of Student-Athletes for Institutional Financial Aid. A student-athlete must meet applicable NCAA (see Bylaw 14), conference and institutional regulations to be eligible for institutional financial aid. If these regulations are met, the student-athlete

may be **granted athletically-related financial aid for a maximum of 10 semesters/15 quarters. Any institutional financial aid provided after 10 semesters/15 quarters is left to the discretion of the institution consistent with institutional policies for awarding financial aid in general. A student-athlete may be** awarded institutional financial aid during any term in which a student-athlete is in regular attendance [i.e., was enrolled initially in a minimum full-time program of studies as defined by the certifying institution during that term (see 15.2.8 for summer term exception)] *under the following circumstances:*.

*"(a) The student-athlete is an undergraduate with eligibility remaining under 14.2 (five-year / 10-semester rule);*

*"(b) The student-athlete is a graduate student eligible under 14.1.7; or*

*"(c) Within six years after initial enrollment in a collegiate institution (provided the student does not receive such aid for more than five years during that period); however, after the six-year period expires, this restriction shall apply only to unearned athletics aid for which the athletics department intercedes on behalf of the student-athlete.*

**"15.01.6.1 Final Semester/Quarter. A student-athlete may receive athletically-related financial aid while enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies, provided the student is enrolled in the final semester or quarter of his or her baccalaureate degree program and the institution certifies that the student is carrying (for credit) the courses necessary to complete the degree requirements."**

*"[Note: See 13.1.1.3 for the financial aid implications in the prohibition against contacting student-athletes of another four-year collegiate institution without permission of that institution's athletics director.]"*

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The Legislation Committee believes this change clearly meets the objective of deregulation to decrease the amount of legislation contained in the Division II manual. Current legislation specifies that a student-athlete may be awarded institutional financial aid during the first 10 semesters/15 quarters of full-time enrollment or when the student-athlete is enrolled in the final semester/quarter of his or her degree program and satisfies the requirements of Bylaw 14.1.6.2.1.3. This establishes consistency between legislation relating to a student-athlete's period of eligibility for competition and eligibility for financial aid. Subsequent to the 10 semesters/15 quarters, awarding institutional aid (including athletically-related aid) would be governed by institutional policy consistent with the eligibility of institutional financial aid for the general student body.

**Action:** Adopted, 229-14-2.

**\*NO. 16 (NO. 2-23) (Dereg. No. 2)**

**FINANCIAL AID –  
TUITION WAIVERS**

**Intent:** To specify that institutional tuition waivers not awarded based in any degree on athletics ability are exempt from individual and institutional financial aid limits.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02.4.1, pages 140-141, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.02.4.1 Institutional Financial Aid. The following sources of financial aid are considered to be institutional financial aid:

[15.02.4.1-(a)-(1) and 15.02.4.1-(a)-(2) unchanged]

"(3) Tuition waivers **awarded based in any degree on athletics ability;**"

[Remainder of 15.02.4.1 unchanged]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02.4.3, page 141, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.02.4.3 Exempted Institutional Financial Aid. The following institutional financial aid is exempt and is not counted in determining a student-athlete's full grant-in-aid or in the institution's financial aid limitations:

[15.02.4.3-(a) through 15.02.4.3-(c) unchanged]

"(d) Tuition waivers **awarded solely on bases having no relationship to athletics ability.**"

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** This proposal would permit an institutional-tuition waiver (e.g., the difference between instate and out-of-state tuition rates) to be excluded from counting against either institutional or individual financial aid limits is appropriate in Division II. This exception only applies when the waiver is not related in any manner to athletics ability or contingent upon the receipt of athletically related financial aid. Tuition waivers that are "triggered" by the receipt of nonathletically related institutional aid should not affect a student-athletes' individual limit nor impact the equivalency limit in the student-athlete's sport.

**Action:** Adopted, 201-41-2.

**\*NO. 17 (NO. 2-24) (Dereg. No. 3)**

**FINANCIAL AID –  
ACADEMIC HONORS  
AWARDS AND  
HONORARY  
ACADEMIC AWARDS**

**Intent:** To clarify the application of Academic Honor Awards and Honorary Academic Awards and to exempt Academic Honor Awards from counting in individual financial aid limits.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02.4.3, page 141, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.02.4.3 Exempted Institutional Financial Aid. The following institutional financial aid is exempt and is not counted in determining a student-athlete's full grant-in-aid, **or cost of attendance** or in the institution's financial aid limitations:

"(a) *An honorary **Academic** awards for outstanding academic achievement or an established institutional research grant that meets the criteria set forth in 15.02.6 (and in Divisions I and III must be included in determining if the student-athlete's cost of attendance has been met) below;*

"(1) **Academic Awards that are part of the institution's normal arrangements for academic scholarships, awarded independently of athletics interests and in amounts consistent with the pattern of all such awards made by the institution are exempt from an institution's equivalency computation, provided:**

"(a) The recipient was ranked in the upper 20 percent of the high-school graduating class or achieved a cumulative grade-point average of at least 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) or a minimum ACT sum score of 100 or a minimum SAT score of 1,050 (if taken prior to April 1, 1995) or 1140 (if taken on or subsequent to April 1, 1995); or

"(b) The recipient does not qualify under (a) and has completed at least one academic year in college and achieved a cumulative grade-point average of 3.300 (on a 4.000 scale) for all academic work completed during the student's collegiate enrollment resulting in degree credits at the awarding institution or;

"(2) **An academic award for outstanding academic achievement or a research grant is an award that meets the following criteria:**

"(a) The award or grant is published in the institution's catalog and is a standing scholarship award or an established research grant;

"(b) The basis for the award or grant shall be the candidate's academic record at the awarding institution; and

"(c) The award or grant shall be determined by competition among the students of a particular class or college of the institution."

[15.02.4.3-(b) and 15.02.4.3-(c) unchanged]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02.6, page 141, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

*"15.02.6 Honorary Academic Award / Research Grant. An honorary academic award for outstanding academic achievement or a research grant is an award that meets the following criteria:*

*"(a) The award or grant is published in the institution's catalog and is a standing scholarship award or an established research grant;*

*"(b) The basis for the award or grant shall be the candidate's academic record at the awarding institution; and*

*"(c) The award or grant shall be determined by competition among the students of a particular class or college of the institution.*

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 15.1.1, page 142, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

*"15.1.1 Types of Aid Included in Limit. In determining whether a student-athlete's financial aid exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid, all institutional financial aid (per 15.02.4.2) and all funds received from the following and similar sources shall be included:*

*[15.1.1-(a) through 15.1.1-(b) unchanged]*

*"(c) Other Scholarships and Grants. Other institutional or outside scholarships or grants-in-aid, except an honorary academic award or research grant that is **those Academic Awards** exempted **per 15.02.4.3-(a)** and outside educational grants that may be awarded up to the cost of attendance per 15.2.5.2.2;"*

*[15.1.1-(d) through 15.1.1-(g) unchanged]*

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.2.2.1, page 153, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

*"15.5.2.2.1 Exception. Academic honor awards that are part of the institution's normal arrangements for academic scholarships, awarded independently of athletics interests and in amounts consistent with the pattern of all such awards made by the institution **meet the criteria set forth in 15.02.4.3-(a)** are exempt from an institution's equivalency computation, provided.:*

*"(a) The recipient was ranked in the upper 20 percent of the high-school graduating class or achieved a cumulative grade-point average of at least 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) or a minimum ACT sum score of 100 or a minimum SAT score of 1,050 (if taken prior to April 1, 1995) or 1140 (if taken on or subsequent to April 1, 1995); or*

*"(b) The recipient does not qualify under (a) and has completed at least one academic year in college and achieved a cumulative grade-point average of 3.300 (on a 4.000 scale) for all academic work completed during the student's collegiate enrollment resulting in degree credits at the awarding institution.*

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** These two exempted awards appear in different locations in the manual and have such similar titles that it is difficult to distinguish between them and apply the legislation appropriately. By placing both awards under the same "heading" and establishing the Academic Honor Award as one type of "Academic Award" and the Honorary Academic Award as a second type of "Academic Award," the legislation would be much easier to locate and apply. The "new bylaw" would be set forth in the "definitions and applications" section of Bylaw 15 as exempted institutional financial aid. This would also mean that the Academic Honor Award would no longer count against the student-athlete's individual financial aid limit. The committee believes that this is a student-athlete welfare issue. Currently, a student-athlete must count an Academic Honor Award in determining if he or she has met the individual financial aid limit. If the award causes the student-athlete to exceed this limit, he or she must forfeit the award or reduce other institutional aid. The committee believes that, when an award is based on academic achievement and is unrelated to athletics, it should not count against either the individual or institutional financial aid limits.

**Action:** Adopted, 243-3-0.

**\*NO. 18 (NO. 2-25) (Dereg. No. 4)**

**FINANCIAL AID –  
EMPLOYEE  
DEPENDENT TUITION  
BENEFITS**

**Intent:** To eliminate the requirement that an institution must count "employee dependent tuition benefits" against individual and institutional limits.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02.4.1, pages 140-141, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

[15.02.4.2.-(a)-(1) through 15.02.4.2-(a)-(3) unchanged.]

*"(4) Employee dependent tuition benefits."*

[Remainder of 15.02.4.2 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02.4.3, page 141, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

[15.02.4.3-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to all students and administered on the same basis for all students; *and*

"(c) Employment during official vacation periods; **and**

**"(d) Employee dependent tuition benefits."**



**Source:** NCAA Division II President Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The committee believes that requiring institutions to count such benefits is not consistent with the Division II philosophy. Athletics department staff members and financial aid directors have little or no discretion or influence related to these grants since such grants are awarded per institutional policy to all dependents of institutional employees. Further, a student-athlete should not be required to "forfeit" such a grant because it would cause the student-athlete to exceed his or her individual limit. Additionally, the equivalency value in the student-athlete's sport should not be affected by such an award.

**Action:** Adopted, 232-14-1.

**\*NO. 19 (NO. 2-26) (Dereg. No. 5)**

**FINANCIAL AID –  
ON-CAMPUS  
EMPLOYMENT**

**Intent:** To exempt all on-campus employment earnings from both individual and institutional financial aid limits.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02.4.1, pages 140-141, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.02.4.1 Institutional Financial Aid. The following sources of financial aid are considered to be institutional financial aid:

"(a) All funds administered by the institution, which include but are not limited to the following:

"(1) Scholarships;

"(2) Grants;

"(3) Tuition waivers;

"(4) Employee dependent tuition benefits; **and**

"(5) Loans; *and*

"(6) *On-campus employment (including work-study program assistance) in the athletics department and on-campus employment outside the athletics department for which the athletics interests of the institution intercede on behalf of the student-athlete (other than institutional staff members responsible for assisting all students in securing on-campus employment, including work study, in the same manner);"*

[Remainder of 15.02.4.1 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.1.1-(a), page 142, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.1.1 Types of Aid Included in Limit. In determining whether a student-athlete's financial aid exceeds the value of a full

grant-in-aid, all institutional financial aid (per 15.02.4.1) and all funds received from the following and similar sources shall be included:

"(a) **Off-campus Employment.** **Off-campus Employment** during semester or term time (which is an all-inclusive period from the opening to the closing of classes of the regular semester, quarter or term), *except for the legitimate on- or off-campus employment of Division I student-athletes who may receive earnings per 15.2.6.1 up to the value of a full grant plus \$2,000 and the legitimate off-campus employment of Division II student-athletes (also see 15.2.6); for which either athletics department staff members or representatives of the institution's athletics interests were involved in arranging the employment.*"

[Remainder of 15.1.1 unchanged.]

C. **Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.6, pages 146-147, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.2.6 **Off-campus Employment.** The institution must include earnings from the student-athlete's **off-campus** employment during semester or term time [per 15.1.1-(a)] in determining whether his or her full grant-in-aid has been reached.

"15.2.6.1 **Exception—Off-campus Employment Earnings.** Earnings from a student-athlete's legitimate off-campus employment, in excess of a full grant-in-aid shall be exempt, provided neither athletics department staff members nor representatives of the institution's athletics interests are involved in arranging the employment. Earnings from such employment by a representative of the institution's athletics interests may be exempted, provided the student-athlete secures the employment in the same manner as other members of the general public.

"15.2.6.2 **No Institutional Aid Received.** A student-athlete who is not receiving institutional financial aid may earn legitimate income **from off-campus employment** in excess of a full grant-in-aid, provided neither members of the athletics department nor representatives of the institution's athletics interests are involved in arranging the employment.

"15.2.6.3 **Christmas Vacation Employment.** A student-athlete receiving financial aid under this section may obtain a job **off-campus** within seven days prior to the beginning of the institution's Christmas vacation period, provided it is a prerequisite to securing the employment. The income so derived from the additional week's employment need not be computed in determining the student's maximum allowable financial aid. However, any earnings for work performed after the first day of classes shall be countable.

[15.2.6.4 through 15.2.6.6 unchanged.]

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02.4.3, page 141, as follows:  
[Division II, roll call]

"15.02.4.4 Exempted Institutional Financial Aid. The following institutional financial aid is exempt and is not counted in determining a student-athlete's full grant-in-aid or in the institution's financial aid limitations:

[15.02.4.3-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to all students and administered on the same basis for all students; *and*

"(c) Employment during official vacation periods.; **and**

**"(d) On-campus employment (including work-study program assistance)."**

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The Legislation Committee believes that all on-campus employment earnings should be exempted from being considered countable institutional aid inasmuch as the majority of the Division II membership have budget restraints prohibiting the institution from employing student-athletes and allowing the student-athlete to receive earnings without actually performing the job duties. In this regard, it seems reasonable for an institution to be permitted to exempt employment earnings against institutional financial aid limits regardless of where the student-athlete is employed and how the individual secured the employment. Further, since on-campus employment earnings are considered "institutional financial aid," some student-athletes are prohibited from accepting on-campus employment to earn extra money because the earnings cause the individual to exceed his or her individual financial aid limit. The committee believes this "principle" should apply to all on-campus employment including that employment for which athletics interests and/or athletics staff intercede as well as employment in the athletics department or other athletics facilities. Any employment (on- or off-campus) will continue to be governed by NCAA Bylaw 12.4.1, which requires that compensation may be paid to a student-athlete only for work actually performed and at a rate commensurate with the going rate in the locality of the institution for similar services.

**Action:** Adopted, 215-28-0.

**\*NO. 20 (NO. 2-27) (Dereg. No. 6)**

**EXEMPTED  
GOVERNMENT  
GRANTS – FEDERAL  
SUPPLEMENTAL  
EDUCATION  
OPPORTUNITIES  
GRANT (SEOG)**

**Intent:** To add the Federal Supplemental Education Opportunities Grant to the list of government grants that may be exempted from institutional and individual limits.

**Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.4.1, pages 144-145, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.2.4.1 Exempted Government Grants. The following government grants for educational purposes shall not be included when determining the permissible amount of a full grant-in-aid or cost of attendance of a student-athlete:

[15.2.4.1-(a) through 15.2.4.1-(g) unchanged]

"(h) Vocational Rehabilitation for Service-Disabled Veterans Program. Benefits received by student-athletes under the Vocational Rehabilitation for Service-Disabled Veterans Program; *or*

"(i) Welfare Benefits. Welfare benefits received from a state or federal government.; **or**

"(j) **Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunities Grant (SEOG). Payments received as part of the SEOG program."**

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The committee believes that this proposed change is in the spirit of deregulation inasmuch as the modification will no longer require institutions to include a SEOG toward individual financial aid limits or institutional limits (when the student-athlete is a counter). The committee believes that a student-athlete who receives a grant that is based on financial need, much like the Pell Grant, should be permitted to receive such a grant without affecting the individual or institutional financial aid limits, even when the institution has involvement in the selection of the recipients and amounts. The committee is not concerned with abuse of such a change inasmuch as the financial aid office has authority of administration of this award, selection of recipients and the amount shall may not be based on athletics ability. Further, institutional financial aid offices annually are audited in regards to the administration of SEOG funds.

**Action:** Adopted, 200-42-5.

**\*NO. 21 (NO. 2-29) (Dereg. No. 7)**

**FINANCIAL AID – OFF-CAMPUS  
EMPLOYMENT  
DURING VACATION  
PERIOD**

**Intent:** To exempt, from institutional and individual financial aid limits, earnings from off-campus employment that occurs during any institutional vacation period.

- A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.6 by adding new 15.2.6.3, page 146, as follows:  
[Division II, roll call]

[15.2.6.1 and 15.2.6.2 unchanged.]

**"15.2.6.3 Exception – Vacation Period Employment. Earnings from a student-athlete's off-campus employment that occurs during an institutional vacation period shall be exempt from both institutional and individual financial aid limits. This includes employment arranged by either an athletics department staff member or a representative of the institution's athletics interests."**

[15.2.6.3 through 15.2.6.4 renumbered as 15.2.6.4 through 15.2.6.5, unchanged.]

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.6.4, page 146, as follows:  
[Division II, roll call]

*"15.2.6.4 Christmas Vacation Employment. A student-athlete receiving financial aid under this section may obtain a job within seven days prior to the beginning of the institution's Christmas vacation period, provided it is a prerequisite to securing the employment. The income so derived from the additional week's employment need not be computed in determining the student's maximum allowable financial aid. However, any earnings for work performed after the first day of classes shall be countable."*

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The Legislation Committee feels that the current restrictions on off-campus employment should remain. In particular, any off-campus employment for which athletics interests or athletics staff intercede should continue to count against individual and institutional limits. However, the committee believes that employment earnings during official institutional vacation periods should be exempt from both individual and institutional financial limits. Currently, in Division II, it is rare for any off-campus employment to be counted against financial aid limits since most student-athletes secure such employment in the same manner as the general student body. Institutions that have procedures in place to effectively monitor off-campus employment continue to have difficulty monitoring such employment during vacation periods. To avoid inadvertent secondary violations, the committee recommends elimination of this requirement and feels that no competitive advantage will be gained from this modification.

**Action:** Adopted, 238-8-1.

**\*NO. 22 (NO. 2-30) (Dereg. No. 8)**

**SUMMER FINANCIAL  
AID**

**Intent:** To permit Division II institutions to provide summer financial aid to student-athletes in accordance with institutional policy applicable to the general student body.

**Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.7, page 146, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.2.7 Summer Financial Aid. Summer financial aid may be awarded only to attend the awarding institution's summer term, summer school or summer orientation program, *provided the following conditions are met: in accordance with institutional policy.*

"(a) *The student has been in residence a minimum of one term during the regular academic year;*

"(b) *The student is attending a summer term, summer school or summer orientation program and financial aid is administered pursuant to 15.2.8.1.2 for incoming student-athletes during the summer prior to their initial full-time collegiate enrollment; or*

"(c) *The student is a two-year or a four-year college transfer student and is receiving aid to attend the awarding institution's summer orientation program."*

"15.2.7.1 General Stipulations. A student-athlete who is eligible for institutional financial aid during the summer is not required to be enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies. However, the student-athlete may not receive financial aid that exceeds the cost of a full grant-in-aid for attendance in that summer term.

"15.2.7.2 Separate Award Required. It is necessary to make an additional award for a summer term, inasmuch as a member institution is limited to the award of financial aid for a period not in excess of one academic year.

"(a) *The recipient shall be admitted to the awarding member institution in accordance with regular, published entrance requirements;*

"(b) *The recipient, if recruited, is subject to NCAA transfer provisions pursuant to 14.5.2-(h);*

"(c) *During the summer term or orientation period, the recipient shall not engage in any organized athletics practice activities (see 17.02.1.1); and*

"(d) *The awarding institution certifies in writing that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability. The written certification shall be on file in the office of the director of athletics and shall be signed by the faculty athletics representative and the director of financial aid.*

"15.2.7.2 Separate Award Required. It is necessary to make an additional award for a summer term, inasmuch as a member institution is limited to the award of financial aid for a period not in excess of one academic year.

"15.2.7.3 Employment during Summer. A student-athlete may receive legitimate summer employment earnings without any

*restriction on the amount of compensation received even if the student-athlete is attending summer school as a recipient of institutional financial aid. Further, such employment earnings are not considered in determining the amount of athletically related financial aid the student-athlete may receive for the summer term.*

*"15.2.7.4 Branch School. An institution may not provide a student-athlete with financial aid to attend a summer session at a branch campus of the institution.*

*"15.2.7.5 Olympic Waivers. Waivers of the restriction that financial aid may be utilized only to attend the awarding institution's summer term or summer school may be approved by the Management Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, for member institutions that have summer terms or summer schools curtailed because of the use of their facilities for the Olympic Games."*

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The committee feels most of Division II institutions do not have budgets that allow them to award significant amounts of summer athletically-related financial aid. For those institutions that award athletically-related summer aid, the policies and rules related to the award should be set by the institution and should be monitored by the financial aid office consistent with the monitoring of other institutional aid provided to the general student body during the summer term(s). Further, from a student-athlete welfare perspective, student-athletes should have the same access to summer athletically-related aid as other students have to other institutional awards and scholarships without the restrictions set forth in the current legislation.

**Action:** Adopted, 218-29-0.

**\*NO. 23 (NO. 2-31) (Dereg. No. 9)**

**FINANCIAL AID –  
AWARDING  
INSTITUTIONAL  
FINANCIAL AID TO  
PROFESSIONAL  
ATHLETE**

**Intent:** To permit a student-athlete who is eligible for competition in a sport to receive athletically-related financial aid, even if the student-athlete is a professional in a second sport and is under contract or receiving compensation from a professional organization in the second sport.

**Bylaws:** Amend 15.3.1.4, page 148, as follows:  
[Division II, roll call]

"15.3.1.4 Institutional Financial Aid to Professional Athlete. It is not permissible to award institutional financial aid to a student-athlete who is under contract to or currently receiving compensation from a professional sports organization in *any* sport **other than the sport in which the individual will participate in a the certifying institution**. However, a student-athlete who currently is receiving institutional financial aid and signs a contract *with* **in the same sport** or receives compensation from an agent or a professional sports organization may continue to receive such aid for the remainder of the term of the award, provided the student-athlete has completed his or her four seasons of competition."

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** In Division II, the majority of student-athletes who become professionals in a sport receive minimal compensation for their participation at the professional level. Currently, a student-athlete who receives minimal compensation for competing in a professional sport and wishes to participate in a different sport at a Division II institution is denied the opportunity to receive athletically-related financial aid. This legislative change would afford a student-athlete who is attempting to play professionally in a sport for minimal compensation (e.g., baseball) the opportunity to receive aid in another sport (e.g., football) at a Division II institution.

**Action:** Adopted, 227-18-1.

**\*NO. 24 (NO. 2-32)(Dereg. No. 10)**

**FINANCIAL AID –  
COUNTERS**

**Intent:** To specify that a student-athlete is not considered a counter solely due to the receipt of earnings from employment in the athletics department or athletics facilities.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.1.2.2, page 150, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

*"15.5.1.2.2 Employment in Athletics Department or Athletics Facilities—Division II. The provisions of 15.5.1.2.3 cannot be used to exempt a recruited student-athlete who is receiving income earned through employment in an athletics department or in athletics facilities (owned or operated by the athletics department); or in other athletics facilities when such employment is arranged by a representative of the institution's athletics interests."*

[15.5.1.2.3 renumbered as 15.5.1.2.3.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.1.3.3, pages 150-151, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]



*"15.5.1.3.3 Employment in Athletics Department or Athletics Facilities—Division II. The provisions of 15.5.1.3.3 cannot be used to exempt a nonrecruited student-athlete who is receiving income earned through employment in an athletics department or athletics facilities (owned or operated by the athletics department) in the student-athlete's sport; or in other athletics facilities when such employment is arranged by a representative of the institution's athletics interests. The provisions of 15.5.1.3.3 cannot be used to exempt a nonrecruited student-athlete who is receiving income earned through employment in an athletics department or athletics facilities in a sport other than the student-athlete's sport if the athletics department intercedes on behalf of the student-athlete; or, if the athletics facilities are not owned or operated by the athletics department, the athletics department may not intercede on behalf of the student-athlete."*

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The Legislation Committee believes that bona-fide employment in the athletics department should not cause an individual to become a counter and therefore requiring all other institutional aid to be counted against the team equivalency limit in the student-athlete's sport. The committee recognizes that it would be possible for an institution to provide a "work scholarship" in the athletics department and therefore not "trigger" counter status enabling the institution to "exempt" all institutional aid received by the student. However, the committee does not feel such legislation would be abused in Division II due to the fact that most athletics budgets with student employment "line items" must be used with scrutiny and that most Division II institutions do not have unlimited financial resources that can be used toward student employment. It is the committee's belief that earnings from a bona-fide job should not affect equivalencies. Further, it is important to note that the existing legislation relating to the certification of noncounter status would remain applicable. Specifically, if a student-athlete receives institutional financial aid (other than athletically-related aid), in order for the student-athlete to not be considered a counter, it must be certified that such aid was granted without regard to athletic ability, this would include employment earnings inside or outside the athletics department. Finally, the committee believes that this is a student-athlete welfare issue inasmuch as this concept provides student-athletes with additional opportunities to earn money when they have been granted minimal amount of athletics aid, without affecting the equivalency limit of their sport.

**Action:** Adopted, 227-20-1.

**\*NO. 25 (NO. 2-33) (Dereg. No. 11)**

**MAXIMUM  
INSTITUTIONAL  
GRANT-IN-AID  
LIMITATIONS –  
INJURY OR ILLNESS  
AFTER INITIAL  
PRACTICE**

**Intent:** To specify that student-athletes sustaining an incapacity injury or illness during or subsequent to the first practice will count during the current academic term but may be exempted in subsequent academic terms.

**Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.1.4.1, page 151, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.5.1.4.1 Injury or Illness after Initial Practice. If an incapacitating injury or illness occurs on or subsequent to a student-athlete's initial practice in the sport, and results in the student-athlete's inability to compete ever again, the student-athlete shall be counted in the institution's maximum financial aid limitations for the current academic year **term**, but need not be counted in subsequent academic years **terms**."

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Under current legislation, a student-athlete in this situation would continue to be a counter during any term in the same academic year that occurs subsequent to his or her injury or illness. This often leads an institution to not renew the injured student-athlete's award if the award is for one academic term. If the award is for the academic year, a replacement is not possible until the next year. By deregulating the restrictions on institutional limits, in this situation, an institution may continue to provide the injured student-athlete with financial aid for the remainder of the year and exempt the student-athlete from institutional limits and, if budgets permit, award aid to another student-athlete without exceeding the equivalency limit in the student-athlete's sport in the same academic year. Current legislation permits an institution to exempt a student-athlete's aid for an entire academic year if an injury occurs prior to his or her initial practice. This proposal will require the institution to count the student-athlete for one term (if the injury occurred during or subsequent to the first practice), but would not penalize the institution and the student-athlete in subsequent terms.

**Action:** Adopted, 238-6-1.

**\*NO. 26 (NO. 2-34) (Dereg. No. 12)**

**FINANCIAL AID –  
COUNTERS**

**Intent:** To revise the definition of a "counter" as specified.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.1, pages 150-151, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.5.1 Counters. A student-athlete shall be a counter and included in the maximum awards limitations set forth in this bylaw under **any of** the following conditions:

"(a) *15.5.1.1 Athletics Aid Received.* A student-athlete who is receiving financial aid based in any degree upon athletics ability shall become a counter for the year during which the student-athlete receives the financial aid.

"15.5.1.2 *Recruited Student-Athlete*

"(b) *15.5.1.2.1 Sports Other Than Football and Basketball.* In all sports other than football and basketball in Division I and in all sports in Division II, a student-athlete who was recruited by the awarding institution and who is receiving institutional financial aid (as set forth in 15.02.4.2) shall be a counter **Institutional Financial Aid. A student-athlete who receives institutional financial aid shall be a counter** unless there is on file in the office of the athletics director certification by the faculty athletics representative and the director of financial aid that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability.

"15.5.1.2.2 *Employment in Athletics Department or Athletics Facilities—Division II.* The provisions of 15.5.1.2.3 cannot be used to exempt a recruited student-athlete who is receiving income earned through employment in an athletics department or in athletics facilities (owned or operated by the athletics department); or in other athletics facilities when such employment is arranged by a representative of the institution's athletics interests.

"(c) *15.5.1.2.3 No Institutional Financial Aid.* A student-athlete who was recruited by the institution but who does not receive institutional financial aid (as set forth in 15.02.4.2) shall not be a counter.

"15.5.1.3 *Nonrecruited Student-Athlete*

"15.5.1.3.1 *No Institutional Financial Aid.* A student-athlete who was not recruited by the institution and who is not receiving any institutional financial aid (as set forth in 15.02.4.2) is not a counter.

"15.5.1.3.2 *Certification—Division II.* In Division II, a student-athlete who was not recruited by the awarding institution and who is receiving institutional financial aid (as set forth in 15.02.4.2) shall not be a counter if there is on file in the office of the athletics director certification by the faculty athletics representative, the admissions officer and the director of financial aid that the student's admission and financial aid were granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability.

"15.5.1.3.3 *Employment in Athletics Department or Athletics Facilities—Division II.* The provisions of 15.5.1.3.3 cannot be used to exempt a nonrecruited student-athlete who is receiving

*income earned through employment in an athletics department or athletics facilities (owned or operated by the athletics department) in the student-athlete's sport; or in other athletics facilities when such employment is arranged by a representative of the institution's athletics interests. The provisions of 15.5.1.3.3 cannot be used to exempt a nonrecruited student-athlete who is receiving income earned through employment in an athletics department or athletics facilities in a sport other than the student-athlete's sport if the athletics department intercedes on behalf of the student-athlete; or, if the athletics facilities are not owned or operated by the athletics department, the athletics department may not intercede on behalf of the student-athlete."*

**B. Amend 15.5.1.2.4, page 150, as follows:**

[Division II, roll call]

**"15.5.1.2.4 15.5.1.1** Employment in Athletics Department or Athletics Facilities—*Division II*. The provisions of 15.5.1.2.3 **15.5.1-(b)** cannot be used to exempt a recruited student-athlete who is receiving income earned through employment in an athletics department or in athletics facilities (owned or operated by the athletics department); or in other athletics facilities when such employment is arranged by a representative of the institution's athletics interests."

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The committee believes that it is not necessary for counter status to be contingent upon the recruited status of a student-athlete. Instead, under the amended legislation, counter status would be contingent primarily on receipt of athletics aid and/or other institutional aid. The manual can be significantly simplified by amending legislation to treat recruited and nonrecruited student-athletes consistently. This proposal does not amend who would be a counter or provide relief to exempt aid that currently would "trigger" counter status. This recommendation simply sets forth three simple criteria for an institution to evaluate when determining the counter status of a student-athlete. The only component lost in this revision is the requirement for the admissions director to certify that the student-athlete's admission was granted without regard to athletics ability. The committee does not believe this is a significant "loss."

**Action:** Adopted, 243-4-2.

**\*NO. 27 (NO. 2-35) (Dereg. No. 13)**

**FINANCIAL AID –  
MULTIPLE-SPORT  
PARTICIPANTS**

**Intent:** To permit an institution, at its discretion, to count financial aid awarded to a multiple sport student-athlete in either sport in which the individual participates, provided the student-athlete, legitimately satisfies the requirements set forth in Bylaw 15.5.3.6.1.

**Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.3, pages 153-154, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.5.3 Multiple-Sport Participants.

*"15.5.3.1 Football. In Divisions I and II football, a counter who was recruited and/or offered financial aid to participate in football and who participates (practices or competes) in football and one or more sports (including basketball) shall be counted in the sport of football. A counter who was not recruited and/or offered financial aid to participate in football and who competes in football and one or more sports (including basketball) shall be counted in the sport of football.*

*"15.5.3.1.1 Initial Counter. A counter who previously has not been counted in the sport of football shall be considered an initial counter even though the student-athlete already has received countable financial aid in another sport.*

*"15.5.3.2 Basketball. A counter who practices or competes in basketball and one or more other sports (other than football) shall be counted in the sport of basketball.*

*"15.5.3.3 Field Hockey. A counter who practices or competes in field hockey and one or more other sports (other than basketball or women's volleyball) shall be counted in field hockey.*

*"15.5.3.4 Volleyball, Women's. A counter who practices or competes in women's volleyball and one or more other sports (other than basketball) shall be counted in women's volleyball.*

*"15.5.3.5 Two-Year Exception. If an individual has participated in a sport other than basketball, field hockey or women's volleyball for two years or more since the individual's initial collegiate enrollment and would be involved only in basketball, field hockey or women's volleyball practice sessions, such a student would not become a counter in those sports until the student actually competes as a member of that institution's intercollegiate team, at either the varsity or junior varsity level.*

*"15.5.3.6 Other Sports. Except as otherwise provided in this section, a counter who participates in two or more sports shall be counted **at an institution's discretion** in one of the sports but shall not be counted in the other(s).*

*"15.5.3.6.1 15.5.3.1 Requirement to Qualify as Multiple-Sport Athlete. To be considered a multiple-sport athlete under this section, an individual must meet all of the following requirements"*

*[15.5.3.6.1-(a) through 15.5.3.6.1-(d) renumbered as 15.5.3.1-(a) through 15.5.3.1-(d), unchanged]*

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Rationale:** Currently, multiple-sport student-athletes who participate in basketball, field hockey or women's volleyball must count in that sport if he or she practices with the team. However, a football

student-athlete who also participates in another sport and was not recruited and not awarded aid in football only counts against football if he practices and competes. In Division II, institutions should have the discretion to count multiple sport athletes in either sport. The Legislation Committee does not feel this would create a competitive advantage and that it will assist in the understanding and application of financial aid legislation. Further, the committee expressed concern that current legislation has provided "loopholes" and permits institutions to "hide" players. Further, the committee believes the legislation needs clarification by eliminating the recruited/non-recruited references inasmuch as contacts and telephone calls are institution specific and, therefore, cause misunderstanding when evaluating the counter of multiple-sport student-athletes.

**Action:** Adopted as amended, 198-51-0.

## NO. 27-1

## FINANCIAL AID – MULTIPLE-SPORT PARTICIPANTS

**Intent:** To permit an institution to count financial aid awarded to a multiple-sport student-athlete within the maximum institutional limitations of either or both sports as specified by the student-athlete's financial aid agreement.

**Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.3, pages 153-154, as follows:

[Division II, roll-call vote]

"15.5.3 Multiple-Sport Participants

*"15.5.3.6 Other Sports. Except as otherwise provided in this section, a A counter who participates in two or more sports shall be counted at an institution's discretion in one of the sports but shall not be counted in the other(s) or both sports as specified on the individuals financial aid agreement."*

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Current legislation setting forth the requirements for counting aid for a multiple-sport student-athlete should be revised. Currently, it is possible to "hide" players in sports in which they were not recruited to play and using equivalencies available in one sport to recruit and grant athletic aid in another sport. More importantly, current legislation arguably restricts participation opportunities in Division II. For example, a student-athlete receiving minimal athletically related financial aid in track and field is not permitted to "walk-on" the basketball team if the institution already had awarded the maximum number of equivalencies in basketball. It is important to note that in order to divide a multiple-sport student-athlete's aid, the individual must meet the legislation criteria set forth in Bylaw 15.5.3.1 (requirement to qualify as a multiple-sport athlete).

This legislation prohibits an institution from counting an individual in any sport that they are not legitimately participating.

**Action:** Adopted, 199-42-6.

**NO. 28 (NO. 2-28)**

**FINANCIAL AID – ON-CAMPUS EMPLOYMENT**

**Intent:** To exempt from individual and institutional limits all on-campus employment earnings outside of the athletics department or athletics facility up to \$2,000 above full grant in aid.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.6 by adding new 15.2.6.2 pages 160-161, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

**"15.2.6.2 Exception – On-Campus Employment Outside the Athletics Department or Athletics Facility. A student-athlete may receive earnings from legitimate on-campus employment during semester or term time in combination with other financial aid included in the student-athlete's individual financial aid limit up to the value of a full grant plus \$2,000."**

[15.2.6.2 through 15.2.6.7 renumbered as 15.2.6.3 through 15.2.6.8.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.3.3 by adding new 15.5.3.3.3, pages 167-168, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

**"15.5.3.3.3 Exception – On-Campus Employment Outside the Athletics Department or Athletics Facility. A student-athlete's earnings from legitimate on-campus employment during semester or term time in combination with other financial aid included in the student-athletes individual financial aid limit up to the value of a full grant plus \$2,000 are exempt from an institution's equivalency computation."**

**Source:** All members of the Northeast-10 Conference and all members of the Peach Belt Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** This proposal would allow a student-athlete to earn up to \$2,000 from on-campus employment without including such earnings in the student-athlete's individual limits and without including the earnings in the equivalency limits in the student-athlete's sport provided the employment is not in the athletics department or an athletic facility owned or operated by the athletics department. Employment earnings that exceed \$2,000 would be considered institutional aid and would be included in the individual limits of the student-athlete. If athletics interests have interceded on behalf of the student-athlete the amount of earnings above \$2,000 would be counted against both the individual limit and also against the institution's team equivalency for the student-athlete's sport.

**Committee Position** (Division II Legislation Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Moot due to the adoption of Proposal No. 19.

**NO. 29 (NO. 2-39)**

**PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS –  
INDIVIDUAL SKILL INSTRUCTION**

**Intent:** In sports other than football, to permit four student-athletes from the same sport to participate in individual skill-related instruction outside of the playing season during the academic year.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.1.6.2.1, page 197, as follows:

[Division II]

"17.1.6.2.1 Skill Instruction—*Divisions I and II.* Participation by *Divisions I and II* student-athletes in individual skill-related instruction [including the activities set forth in 17.02.1.1-(f)] in sports other than football is permitted outside the institution's declared playing season, provided in *Division I* no more than four student-athletes from the same team and in *Division II* no more than three student-athletes from the same team are involved in skill-related instruction with their coach(es) at any one time in any facility and the student-athletes request the instruction."

**Source:** All members of the Carolinas Virginias Conference, all members of the Lone Star Conference and all members of the North Central Intercollegiate Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Currently, only three student-athletes are permitted to participate in individual skill instruction at any one time in any facility. This proposal, if adopted, will enhance student-athlete welfare by allowing them the flexibility to participate in skill instruction with the number of student-athletes appropriate for their sport. Many skill instruction sessions are more efficiently and effectively conducted with four rather than three student-athletes. This proposed amendment would make the skill instruction legislation consistent with the skill instruction legislation in Division I.

**Council/Committee Positions** (Division II Presidents Council and Legislation Committee): The Council and committee support this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted.

**\*NO. 30 (NO. 2-42)**

**MEN'S CHAMPIONSHIPS –  
SPONSORSHIP CRITERIA – MINIMUM  
PERIOD**

**Intent:** To specify that a new championship may be established in a men's sport if the minimum number of sponsoring institutions exists for one academic year (rather than for two consecutive academic years).



**Bylaws:** Amend 18.2.4.2.1, Page 256, as follows:  
[Division II]

"18.2.4.2 Sponsorship Criteria

"18.2.4.2.1 Minimum Period. *In men's sports, the applicable minimum sponsorship number must exist for two consecutive academic years in order for a championship to be established. Legislation to establish the championship may be proposed during the second year in which the minimum sponsorship number exists. In women's sports,* ~~t~~*The applicable minimum sponsorship number must exist for one academic year in order for a championship to be established. Legislation to establish the championship may be proposed during the year in which the minimum sponsorship number exists. Varsity sports sponsored before August 1, 1994, shall count toward the minimum one- or two-year sponsorship requirement.*

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Management Council).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** This proposal will enable legislation to establish a men's championship to be proposed during the year in which the minimum sponsorship number exists. This proposal mirrors 2000 Convention Proposal No. 20, which created the same opportunity to establish a women's championship. Even with the adoption of this proposal, legislation to establish a men's championship must still be adopted by the membership. This proposal allows that legislation to be sponsored one year earlier.

**Action:** Adopted.

---

## AMATEURISM

### \*NO. 31 (NO. 2-4)

### AMATEURISM – EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES

**Intent:** To permit individuals to accept educational expenses (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board and books) prior to collegiate enrollment from any individual or entity other than an agent, professional sports team/organization or representative of an institution's athletics interests, provided such expenses are disbursed directly through the recipient's educational institution (e.g., preparatory school, high school).

**Bylaws:** Amend 12.1.1.1.3, page 58, as follows:  
[Division II]

"12.1.1.1.3 Educational Expenses. Educational expenses not permitted by the governing legislation of this Association (see Bylaw 15 regarding permissible financial aid to enrolled student-athletes).

**"12.1.1.1.3.1 Educational Expenses – Prior to Collegiate Enrollment.** Educational expenses (i.e., tuition fees, room and board and books) provided to an individual prior to collegiate enrollment from any individual or entity other than an agent, professional sports team/organization or a representative of an institution's athletics interests, provided such expenses are disbursed directly through the recipient's educational institution (e.g., high school, preparatory school).

"12.1.1.1.3.1.2 Educational Expenses from Outside Sports Team or Organization – **Subsequent to Collegiate Enrollment.** Educational expenses provided to an individual **subsequent to collegiate enrollment** by an outside sports team or organization that are based in any degree upon the recipient's athletics ability [except as specified in Bylaw 15.2.5.5], even if the funds are given to the institution to administer to the recipient.

"12.1.1.1.3.1.2.1 Educational Expenses—U.S. Olympic Committee. *An individual (prospective student-athlete or student-athlete)* may receive educational expenses awarded by the U.S. Olympic Committee pursuant to the applicable conditions set forth in 15.2.5.5.

"12.1.1.1.3.1.2.2 Educational Expenses-U.S. National Governing Body. *An individual (student-athlete or prospective student-athlete)* may receive educational expenses awarded by a U.S. national governing body (NGB) in accordance with the applicable conditions set forth in Bylaw 15.2.5.5."

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

**Effective Date:** Immediately.\*

**Rationale:** During the course of the last few years, the Association has been confronted with numerous situations that have involved prospective student-athletes receiving educational expenses from outside sports teams and organizations and individuals on whom the prospect was not naturally or legally dependent. In most instances, such expenses have been provided to enable the prospect to attend a preparatory school for the purpose of achieving the necessary requirements to satisfy NCAA initial-eligibility requirements. Current legislation precludes such prospects from receiving any expenses from an outside sports team or organization based on any degree on athletics ability. Further, current regulations also precludes prospective student-athletes from receiving educational assistance awarded from an established and continuing program to aid students in secondary schools when athletics participation is considered a major criterion for the award. Such a standard is more restrictive than the standard that is imposed on current student-athletes who are permitted to receive such assistance,

provided such aid is included in the institution's team limits in the applicable sport if the recipient has been recruited by the certifying institution. It seems inconsistent that prospective student-athletes should be held to a higher standard than current student-athletes as it relates to the receipt of educational expenses to attend a secondary institution. In addition, the proposed amendment to permit any individual or entity (other than an agent, professional sports team or organization or institutional booster) is consistent with the efforts for deregulating amateurism rules prior to collegiate enrollment and has appropriate safeguards to ensure that competitive equity is maintained in the recruiting process.

**Action:** Adopted, effective immediately.

---

## RECRUITING

### \*NO. 32 (NO. 2-8)

### RECRUITING – PUBLICITY

**Intent:** To permit athletics department staff members and, under special conditions, coaches to serve as announcers for high-school, college preparatory school or two-year college contests.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.11.3.1, page 90, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.11.3.1 Announcer for High-School Broadcast. A member of *the athletics staff of a member* **an** institution's **coaching staff** may not serve as an announcer or commentator for a high-school, college preparatory school or two-year college contest, or appear (in person or by means of film, audio tape or videotape) on a radio or television broadcast of such contest **in the staff member's sport during any time that the staff member is under contract with the member institution.** This restriction does not apply to contests involving national teams in which prospective student-athletes may be participants, including the Olympic games.

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** In Division II, such a prohibition should not apply to non-coaching staff members and preclude such individuals (e.g., sports information directors, athletics directors, etc.) from gaining outside employment through broadcasting opportunities. To be consistent with other previous deregulation proposals, it also makes sense that this apply to coaches on a sport-specific basis and only while under contract with a member institution.

**Action:** Adopted.

**Intent:** To permit noncoaching members of an institution's athletics staff to serve as an announcer or commentator on high school, college preparatory or two-year college radio or television broadcasts.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.11.3.1, page 99, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.11.3.1 Announcer for High-School Broadcast. A member of the *athletics coaching* staff of a member institution may not serve as an announcer or commentator for a high-school, college preparatory school or two-year college contest, or appear (in person or by means of film, audio tape or videotape) on a radio or television broadcast of such contest. *In Division III, this restriction applies only to members of an institution's coaching staff (e.g., full-time, part-time, volunteer).* This restriction does not apply to contests involving national teams in which prospective student-athletes may be participants, including the Olympic Games."

**Source:** All members of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference and all members of the Northeast-10 Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Consistent with the deregulation efforts of Division II, this proposal would permit athletics staff (other than coaches) to earn outside income by participating in selected radio or television broadcasts. This opportunity already exists in Division III and would be considered permissive legislation.

**Committee Position** (Division II Legislation Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Moot due to adoption of Proposal No. 32.

---

## **ELIGIBILITY**

**Intent:** To indicate that an individual would not utilize a semester by enrolling in a joint college/high school program unless the individual practices or competes for the college's athletics programs.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.2.3.3, page 110, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.2.3.3 Joint College/High-School Program. A student-athlete's eligibility under the five-year/10-semester rule does not begin while a student is enrolled in a collegiate institution in a joint

high-school/college academic program for outstanding high-school students, in which the courses count as both high-school graduation credit and college credit, provided the student is classified as a special student; is not considered by the college to be regularly matriculated, and *is not eligible* **does not practice (including limited pre-season tryouts) or compete** for the college's athletics programs.

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Recently, there have been situations in which prospective student-athletes have "triggered" the start of the "ten-semester clock" by enrolling in a joint college/high-school program in which concurrently they were eligible for the college's athletics teams. Current legislation requires that an Administrative Review Subcommittee waiver request be approved to avoid using a semester. This proposal would amend the legislation to state that a semester would be used only when the prospect practices or competes with the college team.

**Action:** Adopted.

#### NO. 35 (NO. 2-16)

#### SATISFACTORY PROGRESS – MISSED TERM EXCEPTION

**Intent:** To prohibit the use of the missed-term exception during a student-athlete's initial academic year of residence at the certifying institution.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.4.3.5, page 133, as follows:  
[Division II]

##### "14.4.3.5 Exceptions to Satisfactory-Progress Rule

"(a) Missed term. One time during a student-athlete's entire period of collegiate enrollment, the provisions of 14.4.3.1-(a) may be prorated at 12 hours per term of actual attendance if the student-athlete misses a complete term or consecutive terms during an academic year, subject to the following conditions: (1) The student-athlete engaged in no outside competition in the sport during the academic term or terms in which the student was not in attendance, (2) the student was eligible for enrollment during the student's absence and (3) at the time of certification, the student has fulfilled the satisfactory-progress requirements (per 14.4.3.1) for the terms in which the student was in attendance. *A transfer student from a two-year college is not eligible* **It is not permissible** to utilize this one-time exception during the first academic year of residence at the certifying institution in order to maintain eligibility during the second year in residence. Hours earned while enrolled as a part-time student during the "missed term" may not be counted in meeting the satisfactory-progress requirement."

[14.4.3.5-(b) through 14.4.3.5-(d) unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the North Central Conference and all members of the Pacific West Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Currently, it is possible for student-athletes who initially enroll at the certifying institution in the fall or spring and compete in a sport during that semester, to utilize the missed term exception, and use two seasons of eligibility in the sport prior to completion of one academic year. Ultimately, a student-athlete could utilize four seasons of competition and have only 60 hours of degree credit. In effect, after the fourth season of competition, the student could withdraw from all 12 hours in that specific semester and have completed only 60 hours of degree credit with a 2.0 GPA assuming the student would have fulfilled the minimum satisfactory-progress requirements after the first, second, and third seasons of competition. This modification would force a first year student-athlete to concentrate on academics upon returning to the university during his or her second semester which relates favorably to the NCAA Principle of Sound Academic Standards (Constitution 2.5). In essence, the student-athlete still could receive athletics aid and practice in the second year of enrollment. This proposal attempts to line up seasons of competition with academic years of attendance at the certifying institution. Once the first academic year of residence is complete, student-athletes may use the missed term exception without restriction. It is the hope that student-athletes would have progressed in their academic programs to the point that the impact of using a missed term exception on academic and athletic seasons would be minimal.

**Council/Committee Positions** (Division II Presidents Council and Academic Requirements Committee): The Council and committee support this position on this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted.

**\*NO. 36 (NO. 2-17)**

**TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFER  
ELIGIBILITY – TWO-YEAR  
NONPARTICIPATION EXCEPTION**

**Intent:** To modify the two-year college transfer legislation to permit a student-athlete to be immediately eligible at a Division II institution upon transfer, provided the student satisfies to provisions of the two-year nonparticipation exception applicable to "4-4" and "4-2-4" transfers.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.4.3 by adding new 14.5.4.3.3, pages 126-127, as follows:

[Division II]

[14.5.4.3.1 and 14.5.4.3.2 unchanged.]

**"14.5.4.3.3 Two-Year Nonparticipation Exception.** The student transfers to the certifying institution from a two-year college and, for a consecutive two-year period immediately prior to the date on which the student begins participation (practice and/or competition), the student has neither practiced nor competed in the involved sport in intercollegiate competition, and has neither practiced nor competed in organized noncollegiate amateur competition while enrolled as a full-time student in a collegiate institution. This two-year period does not include any period of time prior to the student's initial collegiate enrollment."

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The Legislation Committee believes that this exception is a reasonable exception to the normal transfer residency requirement and should be available to two-year transfers in the same manner it is available to "4-4" and "4-2-4" transfers. It is important to note that, like the Nonrecruited Student Exception and the Discontinued/Non-sponsored Sport Exception, this exception would not be available, at anytime, to partial qualifiers or nonqualifiers.

**Action:** Adopted.

**\*NO. 37 (NO. 2-18)**

**"4-2-4" TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY -  
NONRECRUITED STUDENT  
EXCEPTION**

**Intent:** To modify the "4-2-4" transfer legislation to permit a student-athlete to be immediately eligible at a second four-year institution upon transfer from a two-year college, provided the student satisfies the provisions of the nonrecruited student exception applicable to two-year transfers.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.6.1, pages 129-130, as follows:  
[Division II]

[14.5.6.1-(a) through 14.5.6.1-(c) unchanged.]

**"(d) Nonrecruited Student Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution and the following conditions are met:**

- "(1) The student was not recruited per 13.02.11.1 by the certifying institution;**
- "(2) No athletically related financial assistance has been received by the student-athlete;**
- "(3) The student-athlete has neither practiced nor competed in intercollegiate athletics prior to transfer, except that a student-athlete may have participated in limited preseason tryouts; and**

**"(4) The student-athlete was eligible for admission to the certifying institution prior to initial enrollment at the two-year college."**

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The Legislation Committee believes that this exception is a reasonable exception to the normal positive transfer residency requirement and should be available to "4-2-4" transfers in the same manner it is available to "4-4" transfers and two-year college transfers. It is important to note that the committee agreed that this exception, similar to the Nonrecruited Student Exception for two-year transfers, includes a provision that the student must have been admissible to the certifying institution when he or she transferred from the original four-year institution.

**Action:** Adopted.

**\*NO. 38 (NO. 2-20)**

**ELIGIBILITY – PENALTY FOR  
INELIGIBLE PARTICIPATION OR  
RECEIPT OF IMPROPER AID**

**Intent:** To eliminate the legislation specifying that the loss of a student-athlete's eligibility due to ineligible participation or receipt of improper aid applies only to the institution involved in the violation.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.11.4.3, page 134, as follows:

[Division II]

*"14.11.4.3 Penalty for Ineligible Participation or Receipt of Improper Aid. A student-athlete who practices or competes in intercollegiate athletics and/or receives institutional financial assistance (based in some degree on athletics ability) while ineligible for such aid, practice or competition per Bylaw 14.3 shall be charged with the loss of one year of eligibility for practice and varsity competition for each year gained improperly. The student-athlete shall be declared ineligible at the time it is determined that eligibility was gained improperly. Before declaring the student-athlete ineligible, the institution may provide the student-athlete an opportunity for a hearing. The institution may appeal to the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee for a reduction in the period of ineligibility. The loss of eligibility shall apply only to the institution involved in the violation."*

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Violations of Bylaws 10, 12, 14, 15 and 16 "follow" a student-athlete when they transfer. A basic element of the student-athlete reinstatement philosophy aims to restore a student-athlete to the position that he or she was in prior to the violation occurring. Currently, if a student-athlete is involved in a violation of Bylaw



14.3 and, subsequently transfers, the student-athlete's ineligibility does not "follow" him or her to the second institution. For example, if a student-athlete receives athletics aid at his or her initial institution and his or her qualifying test score subsequently is cancelled, the reinstatement condition would require the student-athlete to repay the impermissible aid. If the student-athlete would transfer to a second institution, he or she would escape the reinstatement condition of repayment of impermissible aid. Finally, it should be noted that current legislation in Bylaw 14.11.4.1 would apply to all violations of Bylaw 14, and a student-athlete would be ineligible for intercollegiate competition at any institution unless his or her eligibility is reinstated.

**Action:** Adopted.

---

## FINANCIAL AID

<b>*NO. 39 (NO. 2-22)</b>	<b>FINANCIAL AID – COURSE RELATED SUPPLIES</b>
---------------------------	--

**Intent:** To permit an institution to provide a student-athlete with financial aid that covers the actual cost of required course-related supplies and to include such required course-related supplies in the value of a student-athlete's full grant-in-aid.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.01.7, page 140, as follows:  
[Division II]

"15.01.7 Maximum Institutional Financial Aid to Individual. An institution shall not award financial aid to a student-athlete that exceeds the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution or that exceeds the limitations established by the membership division of the institution the student-athlete attends, whichever is less. Any financial aid permitted by a division that would result in a student-athlete's total financial aid exceeding the value of tuition and fees, room and board *and*, required course-related books **and required course-related supplies** shall be based upon the demonstrated financial need of the individual student-athlete (see 15.02.4, 15.2.3, 15.5.2, 15.5.3, 15.5.4 and 15.5.5)."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02.5, page 141, as follows:  
[Division II]

"15.02.5 Full Grant-in-Aid. A full grant-in-aid is financial aid that consists of tuition and fees, room *and*, board *and*, required course-related books **and required course-related supplies**."

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 15.2 by adding new 15.2.4, renumbering subsequent sections, pages 142-147, as follows:  
[Division II]

**"15.2.4 Supplies. An institution may provide a student-athlete financial aid that covers the actual cost of required course-related supplies."**

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.2.2, pages 152-153, as follows:  
[Division II]

"15.5.2.2.3 Equivalency Computations. In equivalency sports, each institutional financial aid award (per 15.02.4.1) to a counter shall be computed as follows:

"(a) Once a student becomes a counter, the institution shall count all institutional aid (per 15.02.4.1) received for room, board, tuition and fees, as well as books **and required course-related supplies** (which shall count for calculation purposes as \$400 in the denominator and, if they are provided or their cost covered by the institution, as \$400 in the numerator, regardless of the actual amount received). Exempted government grants per 15.2.4 and exempted institutional aid per 15.02.4.4 specifically are excluded from this computation."

[15.5.2.2-(b) through 15.5.2.2-(c) unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** In many courses, required supplies (e.g., art supplies, T-squares, special calculators) are a larger cost item than books. If books and/or supplies are provided, the figure of \$400 is placed in both the numerator and the denominator for purposes of calculating a student-athlete's equivalency value. Further, this proposal is intended to permit institutions to provide only those course-related supplies that are required as set forth in regulated on the course syllabus.

**Action:** Adopted.

---

**AWARDS AND BENEFITS**

<b>*NO. 40 (NO. 2-37)</b>	<b>PERMISSIBLE ACADEMIC AND SUPPORT SERVICES – DAY PLANNERS</b>
---------------------------	---

**Intent:** To permit an institution to provide day planners to student-athletes.

**Bylaws:** Amend 16.3.1, page 164, as follows:  
[Division II]

"16.3.1 Permissible. Academic and other support services that may be financed by an institution are:

[16.3.1-(a) though 16.3.1-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) **Organized day planners that are nonelectronic, and are developed and produced by the institution (as opposed to being purchased commercially).**"

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** Immediately.\*

**Rationale:** Current legislation prohibits institutions from providing organizational planners to student-athletes. Day planners can be extremely beneficial to student-athletes in helping them organize their busy schedules and keep all of their appointments. Considering all of the additional time demands placed upon the lives of student-athletes by their participation in athletics, it would be beneficial for institutions to provide them with a simple organizational tool to assist them in managing their lives.

**Action:** Adopted, effective immediately.

---

## PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

### NO. 41 (NO. 2-40)

### CONTEST EXEMPTION – FOOTBALL – TEXAS BOWL

**Intent:** To permit teams from the Lone Star Conference and the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference to participate in the Texas Bowl beyond the legislated end of the playing season and to exempt such participation from the maximum permissible number of contests.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.10.4, pages 224-225, as follows:

[Division II football]

[17.10.4-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Bowl Games, NCAA and NAIA Championships, International Competition, Heritage Bowl *and* , Pioneer Bowl **and Texas Bowl**. One postseason game *approved by the Division I Championships/ Competition Cabinet or those games played in the National Collegiate Division I-AA, Division II and Division III Football Championships; football contests played on a foreign tour certified by the member institution, or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics football championships. In Division I-AA only, a member institution's last contest also may include participation in the Heritage Bowl to be held between representatives of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and the Southwestern Athletic Conference no earlier than the Monday*

*after the conclusion of the National Collegiate Division I-AA Football Championship. In Division II only, a A member institution's last contest also may include participation in the Pioneer Bowl to be held between representatives of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference no earlier than one week after the conclusion of the National Collegiate Division II Football Championship or may include participation in the Texas Bowl to be held between representatives of the Lone Star Conference and the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference."*

[17.10.4.2 unchanged.]

**"17.10.4.3 Texas Bowl Restrictions. All members of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference and the Lone Star Conference shall participate in the Division II Football Championship, if eligible and selected for participation. In addition, members of those conferences that participate in the Division II Football Championship shall not participate in the Texas Bowl during the same year."**

[17.10.4.3 renumbered as 17.10.4.4 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.10.5.2, pages 226-227, as follows:

[Division II Football]

[17.10.5.2-(a) through 17.10.5.2-(d) unchanged.]

**"(e) Texas Bowl. Participation in the Texas Bowl, held between representative of the Lone Star Conference and the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference."**

[17.10.5.2-(e) through 17.10.5.2-(r) relettered as 17.10.5.2-(f) through 17.10.5.2-(s), unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Lone Star Conference and all members of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** This proposed legislation would afford a representative from the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference and a representative from the Lone Star Conference to participate in a postseason bowl game. All members of both conferences would continue to participate in the NCAA Division II Football Championship, if selected. This game would involve only teams not selected for the Division II football playoffs. This legislation is modeled after the Pioneer Bowl and Mineral Water Bowl currently in effect for selected Division II conferences.

**Committee Position** (Division II Championships Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted.

**NO. 42 (NO. 2-41)**

**CONTEST EXEMPTION – FOOTBALL –  
WEST COAST BOWL**

**Intent:** To permit teams from the Pacific West Conference/Columbia Football Association and the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference to participate in the West Coast Bowl beyond the legislated end of the playing season and to exempt such participation from the maximum permissible number of contests.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.10.4, pages 224-225, as follows:

[Division II football]

[17.10.4-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Bowl Games, NCAA and NAIA Championships, International Competition, Heritage Bowl *and* , Pioneer Bowl **and West Coast Bowl**. One postseason game *approved by the Division I Championships/ Competition Cabinet or those games* played in the National Collegiate Division I-AA, Division II and Division III Football Championships; football contests played on a foreign tour certified by the member institution, or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics football championships. *In Division I-AA only, a member institution's last contest also may include participation in the Heritage Bowl to be held between representatives of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference and the Southwestern Athletic Conference no earlier than the Monday after the conclusion of the National Collegiate Division I-AA Football Championship. In Division II only, a* **A** *member institution's last contest also may include participation in the Pioneer Bowl to be held between representatives of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference no earlier than one week after the conclusion of the National Collegiate Division II Football Championship or may include participation in the West Coast Bowl to be held between representatives of the Pacific West Conference/Columbia Football Association and the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference."*

[17.10.4.2 unchanged.]

**"17.10.4.3 West Coast Bowl Restrictions. All members of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference and the Pacific West Conference/Columbia Football Association shall participate in the Division II Football Championship, if eligible and selected for participation. In addition, members of those conferences that participate in the Division II Football Championship shall not participate in the West Coast Bowl during the same year."**

[17.10.4.3 renumbered as 17.10.4.4, unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.10.5.2, pages 226-227, as follows:

[Division II Football]

[17.10.5.2-(a) through 17.10.5.2-(d) unchanged.]

**"(e) West Coast Bowl. Participation in the West Coast Bowl, held between representative of the Pacific West Conference/Columbia Football Association and the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference."**

[17.10.5.2-(e) through 17.10.5.2-(r) relettered as 17.10.5.2-(f) through 17.10.5.2-(s), unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Pacific West Conference and all members of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** This proposed legislation would afford a representative from the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference and a representative from the Pacific West Conference/Columbia Football Association to participate in a postseason bowl game. All members of both conferences would continue to participate in the NCAA Division II Football Championship, if selected. This game would involve only teams not selected for the Division II football playoffs. This legislation is modeled after the Pioneer Bowl and Mineral Water Bowl currently in effect for selected Division II conferences.

**Committee Position** (Division II Championships Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted.

---

## GENERAL

<b>*NO. 43 (NO. 2-43)</b>	<b>ENFORCEMENT – PENALTIES FOR MAJOR VIOLATIONS – DIVISION II</b>
---------------------------	---

**Intent:** To permit the Committee on Infractions to impose financial penalties in cases involving findings of major violations of NCAA legislation.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 19.6.2.2, pages 267-268, as follows:

[Division II]

"19.6.2.2 Disciplinary Measures. In addition to those penalties prescribed for secondary violations, among the disciplinary measures, singly or in combination, that may be adopted by the committee (or the appropriate appeals committee per 19.3) and imposed against an institution for major violations are:

[19.6.2.2-(a) through 19.6.2.2-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) *All or any combination* **One or more** of the following penalties:

"(1) Individual records and performances shall be vacated or stricken, or

"(2) Team records and performances shall be vacated or stricken, or

"(3) Individual or team awards shall be returned to the Association;

**"(f) A financial penalty;**

[19.6.2.2-(f) through 19.6.2.2.2-(l) relettered as 19.6.2.2.2-(g) through 19.6.2.2.2-(m), unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 19.8, page 270, as follows:

[Division II]

**"19.8 RESTITUTION**

"If a student-athlete who is ineligible under the terms of the constitution, bylaws or other legislation of the Association is permitted to participate in intercollegiate competition contrary to such NCAA legislation but in accordance with the terms of a court restraining order or injunction operative against the institution attended by such student-athlete or against the Association, or both, and said injunction is subsequently voluntarily vacated, stayed or reversed or it is finally determined by the courts that injunctive relief is not or was not justified, the Management Council may take any one or more of the following actions against such institution in the interest of restitution and fairness to competing institutions:

[19.8-(a) through 19.8-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) Require that the institution that has been represented in an NCAA championship by such a student-athlete *shall return 90 percent of its share of the net receipts from such competition in excess of the regular expense reimbursement, or if said funds have not been distributed, require that they be withheld by the president* **be assessed a financial penalty as determined by the appropriate divisional Committee on Infractions in that division.**"

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 31.2.2.5, page 318, as follows:

[Division II]

"31.2.2.5 Institutional Penalty for Ineligible Participation. When an ineligible student-athlete participates in an NCAA championship and the student-athlete or the institution knew or had reason to know of the ineligibility, the *president* **appropriate divisional Committee on Infractions in that division may withhold an amount to be determined by the Championships/Competition Cabinet (not to exceed 90 percent of the institution's share of revenue distribution in excess of the regular expense reimbursement). If said funds have been distributed, the institution may be required to return such an amount. [Note: In appropriate cases, in accordance with 19.6.2.2-(e) or 19.8 of the NCAA enforcement program, an institution may not be permitted to receive or may be required to reimburse the Association an amount equal to 90 percent of its share of the revenue distribution.] assess a financial penalty.**"

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Infractions)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** In some instances involving findings of major violations of NCAA legislation, it would be appropriate for the Committee on Infractions to impose financial penalties in the form of fines. Current legislation does not allow for such a penalty upon findings of major violations. Monetary fines, however, may be assessed in secondary violations pursuant to Bylaw 19.6.1-(d). Currently, the only circumstance in which the Committee on Infractions may impose upon an institution a monetary penalty in a major infractions case relates to championship competition. The "90 percent rule" permits the Committee on Infractions to recommend to the Championships Committee that an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the institution's share of revenue distribution in excess of the regular expense reimbursement be withheld in situations in which an ineligible student-athlete participated in championship competition. See Bylaws 19.8-(i) and 31.2.2.5. By way of example, recently, the Division I Championships/Competition Cabinet has experienced some confusion regarding the amount of funds to be withheld, due to such factors as conference revenue sharing policies. Amending the legislation to substitute fines in lieu of the "90 percent rule" would avoid future confusion in all divisions. Allowing the Committee on Infractions to impose reasonable fines, in lieu of the "90 percent rule," when violations are found in certain major infractions cases will provide an appropriate and viable penalty option that currently exists only for findings of violations in secondary infractions cases.

**Action:** Adopted.

**\*NO. 44 (NO. 2-44)      CHANGE OF DIVISION MEMBERSHIP  
– CHAMPIONSHIPS ELIGIBILITY**

**Intent:** To specify that institutions reclassifying from NCAA Division II to Division III are eligible for Division II championships during the three-year reclassification compliance period.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 20.5.3.1, page 276, as follows:

[Division II]

"20.5.3.1 Reclassification from Division II to Division I or *Division III*. A member of Division II that has forwarded to the national office written notice of its intention to change its membership classification to Division I or *Division III* per 20.5.2.1 no longer shall be eligible to participate in any subsequent Division II NCAA championship and no longer shall be eligible to receive Division II Enhancement Fund proceeds."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 31.3.3.6, page 322, as follows:

[Division II]

"31.3.3.6 Exclusion of Institution Reclassifying from Division II to



Division I or *Division III*. In all sports, any Division II institution that has forwarded to the national office written notice of its intention to change its membership classification to Division I per 20.5.2.1 no longer shall be eligible to participate in any subsequent Division II NCAA championship."

**Source:** NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

**Effective Date:** Immediately.\*

**Rationale:** The inclusion of championship eligibility in NCAA Convention Proposal No. 47 was inappropriate. The original intent was to adopt legislation that "mirrored" the legislative requirements that apply when reclassifying from Division II to Division I. The Legislation Committee agreed that retaining eligibility for Division II championships when reclassifying to Division III does not create a competitive advantage and is a student-athlete welfare issue that deserves reconsideration by the membership.

**Action:** Adopted, effective immediately.

**NO. 45**

**RESOLUTION: SENIOR WOMAN  
ADMINISTRATOR**

*"Whereas*, the senior woman administrator (SWA) is the highest ranking female administrator involved with the conduct and administration of an institution's athletics program; and

*"Whereas*, the position of SWA is intended to ensure representation of women's athletics interests at the institution, conference and national levels; and

*"Whereas*, the Division II Management Council and Presidents Council are committed to enhancing the role of the Division II SWA at the institution, conference and national levels; and

*"Whereas*, the SWA appointment should be made by the director of athletics and the chief executive officer of an institution; and

*"Whereas*, the Division II SWA must be instrumentally involved in key decision making for the athletics department; and

*"Whereas*, the Division II SWA is a trusted advisor, team player, advocate for women, a teacher, an important role model for students, coaches, administrators, and others, and dedicated to helping student-athletes understand the importance of successfully balancing academics and athletics; and

*"Whereas*, Division II has budgeted money in its long-range financial plan to enhance the role of the Division II SWA;

*"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved*, that Division II institutions will support and enhance the role of SWA (as defined in Constitution 4.02.4) at the institutional and conference levels. In addition, the Division II Project Team to Review Issues Related to Diversity will explore opportunities to

enhance the position of SWA in Division II and make recommendations to the Management Council and Presidents Council for consideration during the next year."

**Action:** Adopted, effective immediately.

---

### DIVISION III LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

*The NCAA Division III Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division III athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division III chief executive officers.*

*Legislative proposals developed by the Division III Management Council or by Division III committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division III Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division III.*

*The Division III Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division III chief executive officers and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division III Presidents Council for or against a proposal. The only proposals sponsored by the Presidents Council are those identified with an asterisk before the proposal number. All proposals in the Presidents Council grouping are subject to a roll-call vote.*

---

### PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

<b>*NO. 46 (NO. 2-49)</b>	<b>FINANCIAL AID REGULATIONS</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------------

**Intent:** To simplify Division III financial aid legislation by deleting permissible financial aid awards given without consideration of need and the accompanying awards review process. Further, to confirm that financial aid packaging for student-athletes must be consistent with packaging for students in general.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.01, page 107, as follows:  
[Division III, roll call]

"15.01 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- [15.01.1 unchanged]
- [15.01.1.1 unchanged]
- [15.01.2 unchanged]

*"15.01.3 Financial Aid Not Administered by Institution. Any student who receives financial aid other than that administered by the student-athlete's institution shall not be eligible for intercollegiate athletics competition, unless it is specifically approved under the Association's rules of amateurism (see Bylaw 12) or the aid is:*

*"(a) Received from one on whom the student-athlete is naturally or legally dependent;*

*"(b) Awarded solely on bases having no relationship to athletics ability;*

*"(c) Awarded through an established and continuing program to aid students, of which athletics participation shall not be the major criterion (e.g., National Merit Scholarship), under the conditions listed in Bylaw 15.2.5.4; or*

*"(d) Awarded through an established and continuing program for recognition of outstanding high-school graduates, of which athletics participation may be a major criterion (e.g., honorary high-school award), under the conditions listed in Bylaw 15.2.5.6.*

**"15.01.3 Division III Institutional Financial Aid. Division III institutions shall not award financial aid to student-athletes based on athletics participation or performance.**

[15.01.4 unchanged]

**"15.01.5 Athletics Funds or Endowments. No part of an institution's financial aid budget shall be set aside either for particular sports or for athletics in general, nor may an institution establish athletically related quotas of financial aid recipients. However, income from endowment funds that were received by the institution prior to January 1, 1979, and specifically designated for student-athletes can be awarded to student-athletes, provided the institution complies with the requirements set forth in Bylaw 15.4.8.**

**"15.01.6 Athletics Need Fund. A member may not establish an "athletics need fund" for student-athletes and advertise its availability to prospective student-athletes who may qualify for need-based aid.**

[15.01.5 through 15.01.6 renumbered as 15.01.7 through 15.01.8, unchanged]

**"15.01.7 9 Maximum Institutional Financial Aid to Individual. An institution shall not award financial aid to a student-athlete that exceeds the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution or that exceeds the limitations established by the membership division of the institution the student-athlete attends, whichever is less. Any financial aid permitted by a division that would result in a student-athlete's total financial aid exceeding the value of tuition and fees, room and board and required course-related books shall be based on the**

demonstrated financial need of the individual student-athlete (see Bylaws 15.02.2, 15.2.3 and 15.4).

*"15.01.8 Nonrecruited Student-Athlete. If a student-athlete was not recruited and receives institutional financial aid unrelated to athletics ability and in excess of a full grant-in-aid, the student may retain the aid for the period of the award without any adjustment. Once the original period of the award expires, renewal of the same financial aid in excess of the limitation is permissible only if the aid is renewed on the same basis as originally awarded."*

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02, pages 108-109, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

**"15.02 Definitions and Applications**

[15.02.1 through 15.02.2 unchanged]

[15.02.2.1-(a)-(1) through 15.02.2.1-(a)-(6) unchanged]

"(b) Aid from government or private sources for which the institution is responsible for selecting the recipient or determining the amount of aid, or providing matching or supplementary funds for a previously determined recipient; and .

"(c) *For the student-athlete recruited by the institution, financial aid awarded through an established and continuing outside program (e.g., National Football Foundation) for the recognition of outstanding high-school graduates in which athletics participation may be a major criterion, as outlined in Bylaw 15.2.5.6. This aid counts against the individual's full-grant-in-aid limit.*

[15.02.2.2-(a) through 15.02.2.2-(e) unchanged]

*"15.02.2.3 Exempted Institutional Financial Aid. The following institutional financial aid is exempt and is not counted in determining a student-athlete's full grant-in-aid:*

"(a) *An honorary award for outstanding academic achievement or an established institutional research grant that meets the criteria set forth in Bylaw 15.02.6 (and must be included in determining if the student-athlete's cost of attendance has been met);*

"(b) *Legitimate loans, based on a regular repayment schedule, available to all students and administered on the same basis for all students; and*

"(c) *Employment earnings (other than earnings from federal and state work-study program assistance).*

*"15.02.2.4 Exempted Government Grants. Government grants listed in Bylaw 15.2.4.1 shall not be included when determining the permissible amount of a full grant-in-aid.*

[15.02.3 unchanged]

*"15.02.4 Honorary Academic Award/Research Grant. An honorary academic award for outstanding academic achievement*

*or a research grant is an award that meets the following criteria:*

- "(a) The award or grant is published in the institution's catalog and is a standing scholarship award or an established research grant;*
- "(b) The basis for the award or grant shall be the candidate's academic record at the awarding institution;*
- "(c) The award or grant shall be determined by competition among the students of a particular class or college of the institution; and*
- "(d) The award or grant is included in determining if the student-athlete's full grant-in-aid limitation has been met."*

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 15.2, pages 109-113, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

**"15.2 Elements of Financial Aid**

**[15.2.1 unchanged]**

*"15.2.1.1 Permissible Fees. A student-athlete may be awarded financial aid that covers the payment of fees for a course in which the student-athlete is enrolled, if the course is part of the institution's regular curriculum (included in the institution's catalog of classes), and the institution pays these same fees for other students enrolled in the course who receive fees as a part of a grant-in-aid or scholarship.*

*"15.2.1.2 Optional Fees. An institution may not pay fees for services offered on an optional basis to the student body in general (e.g., health insurance).*

*"15.2.1.3 Noninstitutional Fees and Expenses. Fees paid by an institution are confined to required institutional fees and do not include noninstitutional fees or expenses (e.g., the cost of typing reports for student-athletes).*

*"15.2.1.4 Fees and Related Expenses for Prospects. An institution shall not waive, pay in advance or guarantee payment of the following expenses for a prospective student-athlete, unless such benefits generally conform to institutional policy as it applies to other prospective student-grantees:*

- "(a) The institution's processing fee required prior to the admissions office's evaluation of the prospect's application;*
- "(b) The orientation-counseling tests fee required of all incoming freshmen;*
- "(c) The preadmission academic testing fee;*
- "(d) Advance tuition payment or room deposit;*
- "(e) Damage deposits for dormitory rooms;*
- "(f) ROTC deposits for military equipment; or*

"(g) *Any other preenrollment fees required of prospective student-grantees.*

"15.2.1.4.1 *Fees Rebate. If the prospect enrolls and is awarded financial aid covering institutional fees, the fees described in (a) through (d) above may be rebated as a part of the institution's regular fees.*

"15.2.2 *Room and Board. An institution may provide a student-athlete financial aid that includes the cost of room and board, based on the official allowance for room and board as listed in the institution's official publication (e.g., catalog).*

"15.2.2.1 *Off-Campus Room and Board Stipend. If a student-athlete lives and eats in noninstitutional facilities, the institution may pay the student-athlete an amount equal to the institution's official on-campus room and board allowance as listed in its catalog, or the average of the room and board costs of all of its students living on campus, excluding those eating at the training table. Meals provided on the training table shall be deducted at the regular cost figure from such a student-athlete's board allowance.*

"15.2.2.1.1 *Determination of Off-Campus Room Costs. An institution with several official on-campus room rates listed in its catalog must use the average of the room cost for all students living on-campus (based on a weighted average for all students who reside in on-campus facilities).*

"15.2.2.1.2 *Determination of Off-Campus Board Costs. An institution with several on-campus board plans (e.g., 5-day, 7-day, 14-meal, 17-meal or 21-meal plans) may provide a student-athlete living in noninstitutional facilities with the equivalent of a full-board (e.g., 7-day or 21-meal) plan.*

"15.2.2.1.3 *Institution with No On-Campus Room and Board Facilities. If an institution does not provide an official dollar amount for room and board in its catalog and does not have on-campus student room and board facilities, the figure provided to student-athletes for off-campus room and board shall be the amount determined by the institution's office of financial aid as being commensurate with the average cost a student at that institution normally would incur living and eating in off-campus facilities.*

"15.2.2.1.4 *Married Student Housing. Married student-athletes who live in noninstitutional housing are permitted to receive the same room and board allowance that is provided to married students with on-campus housing. If the institution does not provide on-campus room and board facilities for married students but has other on-campus dormitory facilities, it must utilize the provisions of Bylaw 15.2.2.1 in*

*determining the amount of room-and-board expenses a married student-athlete who lives in noninstitutional facilities may receive.*

*"15.2.2.1.5 Cost-Free Apartment. It is permissible for the institution to arrange for a cost-free, off-campus apartment rather than to give a student-athlete an amount equal to the institution's official room allowance (as listed in its catalog), provided the apartment is not rented by the institution at a reduced rate and such a benefit generally conforms to institutional policy as it applies to other student grantees. However, if the actual rental rate is more than the institutional room allowance, the student-athlete shall pay the additional amount from the student-athlete's own resources.*

*"15.2.2.2 Material Housing Benefit. An institution may not provide a benefit connected with on-campus or off-campus student-athletes' housing (e.g., individual television sets or stereo equipment, specialized recreational facilities, room furnishings or appointments of extra quality or quantity) that is not available on the same basis in the housing provided to at least one-half of the other members of the student body who use on-campus housing facilities. Further, these material benefits shall be available for such students in approximately the same ratio as such benefits are available for student-athletes. Otherwise, dormitories with exclusive material housing benefits may not be used by student-athletes.*

*"15.2.2.3 Facility Designated by Institution. It is permissible for the institution to require a grant-in-aid recipient to obtain room and board in a facility designated by the institution, provided the requirement is contained in the written statement outlining the amount, duration, conditions and terms of the financial aid agreement (see Bylaw 15.3.2.4).*

*"15.2.2.4 Summer Dormitory Rentals. An institution may rent dormitory space to a prospective or enrolled student-athlete during the summer months at the regular institutional rate, if it is the institution's policy to make such dormitory space available on the same basis to all prospective or enrolled students.*

*"15.2.2.5 Sunday Evening Meals. If the regular eating facility used by a student-athlete who is receiving an award that covers the cost of meals is not available for a given meal (e.g., Sunday evening meal), the institution may provide actual expenses to cover the cost of the meal, provided the meal is similar to those served at the university's regular dining facilities, is not excessive in nature and such a benefit is provided to the general student-body.*

*"15.2.2.6 Food Stamps. A grant-in-aid recipient who lives and eats off campus may use the money provided for his or her board to purchase governmental food stamps, provided the stamps are available to the student body in general. Additionally, the student-athlete must be eligible for such stamps without any special arrangements on the part of athletics department personnel or representatives of the institution's athletics interests.*

*"15.2.3 Books. An institution may provide a student-athlete financial aid that covers the actual cost of required course-related books, provided the institution pays the actual cost of required course-related books for other students who receive books as part of a grant-in-aid or scholarship.*

[15.2.4 unchanged]

"15.2.5 Financial Aid from Outside Sources

**"15.2.5.1 Report of Aid from Outside Sources. All financial assistance received by the student-athlete from sources outside the institution shall be reported to the institution's director of financial aid. When outside aid is received after the financial aid program of the college has been offered to the students, the institution's director of financial aid shall be notified and an adjustment of the aid already offered shall take place in order that the total aid available from all sources does not exceed the cost of attendance.**

**"15.2.5.2 Aid from Outside Sources. Financial aid received from outside sources that meets the provisions of 15.2.5.4 or 15.2.5.7 (or an award made through the NCAA postgraduate scholarship program) is permissible without consideration of the recipient's financial need.**

[15.2.5.1 through 15.2.5.2 renumbered as 15.2.5.3 through 15.2.5.4 unchanged]

**"15.2.5.3 5 Athletics Participation Not Major as a Criterion. A student-athlete may receive financial aid through an established and continuing program to aid students, provided the following conditions are met:**

[15.2.5.3-(a) renumbered as 15.2.5.5-(a) unchanged]

**"(b) In the case of a recruited student-athlete, d Disbursement of the aid shall be through the member institution for the recipient's educational expenses while attending that institution. A violation of this bylaw shall be considered an institutional violation, per Constitution 2.8.1; however, the violation shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility, provided the student-athlete deposits the aid with the institution, and the aid does not result in an overaward of financial aid to the student-athlete;**



"(c) *In the case of a nonrecruited student-athlete, d Disbursement of the aid may be through the awarding agency for the recipient's educational expenses, provided the aid is awarded prior to the recipient's initial enrollment at a member institution and the awarding agency provides written notification of the award to the institution; and*

[15.2.5.3-(d) renumbered as 15.2.5.5-(d) unchanged]

*"15.2.5.4 Athletics Participation as a Major Criterion. A student-athlete may receive financial aid through an established and continuing program for the recognition of outstanding high-school graduates, provided the following conditions are met:*

*"(a) The award shall be made on the basis of the recipient's past performance and overall record, as measured by established criteria of which athletics participation may be a major criterion;*

*"(b) In the case of a recruited student-athlete, disbursement of the aid shall be through the member institution for the recipient's educational expenses while attending that institution. A violation of this bylaw shall be considered an institutional violation, per Constitution 2.8.1; however, the violation shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility, provided the student-athlete deposits the aid with the institution, and the aid does not result in an overaward of financial aid to the student-athlete; or*

*"(c) In the case of a nonrecruited student-athlete, disbursement of the aid may be through the awarding agency for the recipient's educational expenses, provided the aid is awarded before the recipient's initial enrollment at a member institution and the awarding agency provides written notification of the award to the institution;*

*"(d) The recipient's choice of institutions shall not be restricted by the donor of the aid;*

[15.2.5.4-(e) renumbered as 15.2.5.5-(e) unchanged]

*"(f) The value of the award alone or in combination with other aid per Bylaw 15.1.1 shall not exceed the value of a full grant-in-aid;*

[15.2.5.4-(g) through 15.2.5.4-(h) renumbered as 15.2.5.5-(f) and 15.2.5.5-(g), unchanged]

*"15.2.5.4.1 Award Limited to Athletes. If an individual is considered for a financial aid award only if the individual is a participant in athletics, the provisions of Bylaw 15.2.5.4 shall be applicable.*

*"15.2.5.4.2 5.1 Eligibility Effects of Improper Aid from Outside Organization. It is not permissible for a*

student-athlete to receive financial aid, directly or indirectly, from a source outside the institution (e.g., a foreign government, a sports association, a high-school booster club) for expenses related to attendance at a member institution, if the award of such financial aid is based in any degree upon the recipient's athletics ability, except as permitted in Bylaws 15.2.5.3 and 15.2.5.4. Receipt of financial aid from such a source renders the student-athlete ineligible for all intercollegiate athletics participation.

[15.2.5.5-(a) through 15.2.5.5-(c) renumbered as 15.2.5.6-(a) through 15.2.6-(c), unchanged]

*"15.2.6 Employment. The institution must include employment earnings from the student-athlete's federal and state work-study program assistance in determining whether his or her full grant-in-aid has been reached.*

[15.2.7 unchanged]

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 15.3, page 113, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

**15.3 TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF AWARDED INSTITUTION ON FINANCIAL AID**

[15.3.1 unchanged]

**"15.3.2 Terms of Institutional Financial Aid Award**

*"15.3.2.1 Conformance to Institutional and Conference Regulations. Financial aid awarded by an institution to a student-athlete shall conform to the rules and regulations of the awarding institution and of that institution's conference(s), if any."*

[15.3.2.2 renumbered as 15.3.2.1 unchanged]

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 15.4, pages 113-116, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

**"15.4 DIVISION III FINANCIAL AID**

*"15.4.1 Financial Need Requirement. An institution shall not award financial aid to any student-athlete except upon a showing of financial need by the recipient, except as noted in Bylaw 15.4.6.*

**"15.4.1 Consistent Financial Aid Package. The composition of the financial aid package offered to a student-athlete shall be consistent with the established policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students and shall meet all the following criteria:**

**"(a) A member institution shall not consider athletics ability or participation as a criterion in the formulation of the financial aid package;**

**"(b) The financial aid procedures used for a student-athlete are the same as the existing official financial aid policies of an institution;**

- "(c) The financial aid package for a particular student-athlete cannot be clearly distinguishable from the general pattern of all financial aid for all recipients at the institution; and
- "(d) A financial aid package for a student-athlete must be equivalent to individual packages for other students with similar need characteristics; and
- "(e) The percentage of the total dollar value of institutionally administered grants awarded to student-athletes shall be closely equivalent to the percentage of student-athletes within the student body. A differential is defensible if it can be demonstrated that the average need of the student-athletes at the institution is equivalently greater than the average need of other students.

[15.4.2 through 15.4.3 unchanged]

"15.4.5 *Financial Aid Limit.* A student-athlete may not receive financial assistance based upon need in excess of the value of a full grant-in-aid (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board, required course-related books, transportation, and other expenses incidental to attendance, provided the total value of all financial aid does not exceed the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution).

"15.4.5.1 **4 Need Analysis Method.** Any **need-based** assistance provided within the limit defined in Bylaw 15.4.5 to a student-athlete must be based on financial need as determined by need analysis methodologies that conform to federal, state and written institutional guidelines. The methodologies used to determine the need of a student-athlete shall be consistent with the methodologies used by the institution for all students.

"15.4.6 *Aid without Consideration of Need.* Loans and awards specified in the following subsections may be offered to student-athletes without consideration of the recipient's need.

"15.4.6.1 *Loans.* Legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to and administered on the same basis for all students.

"15.4.6.2 *Academic Honor Awards.* Academic honor awards that are part of the institution's normal arrangements for academic scholarships, awarded independently of athletics interests and in amounts consistent with the pattern of all such awards made by the institution, may be offered only to:

- "(a) A student who was in the upper 20 percent of the high-school graduating class or who earned a cumulative high-school grade-point average of at least 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) or who achieved a minimum ACT sum score of 100 or a minimum SAT

score of 1,050 (if taken prior to April 1, 1995) or 1140 (if taken on or subsequent to April 1, 1995), or

"(b) A student who does not qualify under (a) and who has completed at least one academic year in college and has earned a cumulative grade-point average of 3.300 (on a 4.000 scale) for all academic work completed during the student's collegiate enrollment resulting in degree credits at the awarding institution.

"15.4.6.2.1 Additional Requirements. The following additional academic honor requirements shall be met:

"(a) The awards may include additional, nonacademic criteria (e.g., interviews, essays), provided the additional criteria are not based on athletics ability or participation and the awards are consistent with such awards provided to all students;

"(b) No quota of awards shall be designated for student-athletes;

"(c) Athletics participation shall not be required before or after college enrollment;

"(d) No athletics department staff member shall be involved in designating the recipients of such awards; and

"(e) Any additional criteria shall not include athletics ability or participation.

"15.4.6.3 Awards of Circumstance. Awards of circumstance may be given by the college or university, provided:

"(a) These awards automatically are available to any and all members of the student body in general who meet certain publicized, objective qualifications and are awarded solely on bases having no relationship to athletics ability;

"(b) The institution may establish no quota of such awards for student-athletes;

"(c) The awards shall be identified in the appropriate institutional publication listing financial aid awards available to all students, and each such award shall be reported to and specifically approved by the Management Council; and

"(d) Such an award shall be provided automatically to any student who qualifies under the circumstances in question. The award to a student who qualifies under a particular set of circumstances would not qualify as an award of circumstance if the selection of the student was at the institution's discretion.

"15.4.6.4 Nonathletics Achievement Awards. The Management Council shall have the authority to approve requests from institutions to grant nonathletics achievement awards to student-athletes under the following conditions:

"(a) *Recipients of such awards must be selected by a committee composed of institutional staff members (excluding athletics department staff members);*

"(b) *Competition for such an award must be among all members of the student body in general who meet certain publicized qualifications, the award must have no relationship to athletics ability or participation, the institution may establish no quota for such awards for student-athletes, the form utilized by a student-athlete to apply for such an award must have no reference to athletics ability or participation, the award must be identified in the appropriate institutional publication listing financial aid awards available to all students, and the award must be consistent with Bylaw 15.4.8; and*

"(c) *The Management Council shall establish a process for granting requests for approval of nonathletics achievement awards; shall monitor the actions taken under this authorization; and shall report annually to the membership the actions taken in summary, aggregate form.*

"15.4.6.5 *On-Campus Employment. On-campus employment offered by the awarding institution is permissible under the following conditions:*

"(a) *Such employment is under the direction of the regular college agency or committee that administers such employment for all students, and*

"(b) *The policies and practices in regard to such employment are identical for athletes and nonathletes.*

"15.4.8.2 **5** *Specialized Interests in Activities as a Packaging Variable. A member institution may offer a student-athlete a financial aid package that takes into account variables in the packaging formula other than need (e.g., academic ability, minority status, specialized interests in activities other than athletics), provided the package does not exceed the recipient's financial need. A member institution shall not consider athletics ability as a criterion in the formulation of the financial aid package* **cost of attendance.**

[15.4.8.3 through 15.4.8.5 renumbered as 15.4.6 through 15.4.8 unchanged]

[15.4.9 unchanged]

"15.4.10 *Membership Reclassification. An institution petitioning to reclassify its membership to Division II in the next academic year may offer financial aid exceeding need* **based on athletics** *to prospective student-athletes who will enroll in the institution after the review of its request for reclassification of division membership, provided:*

"(a) The financial aid *exceeding need* **based on athletics** is not actually awarded until the reclassification becomes effective;

[15.4.10-(b) unchanged]

"(c) Any offer *exceeding the* **of athletically related financial aid need of the recipient** states in writing that the awarding of such aid is contingent upon the reclassification being approved; and"

[15.4.10-(d) unchanged]

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Financial Aid and Awards Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Over the past two years, the NCAA Division III Financial Aid and Awards Committee carefully reviewed Bylaw 15 and the awards review process. At the conclusion of this review, it was clear that the current practice of reviewing awards of circumstance and nonathletics achievement awards does not effectively or efficiently ensure institutional compliance with the Division III philosophy or bylaws. Further, the current methodology does not reveal sufficient data to determine institutional compliance. Therefore, the committee recommends the adoption of this proposal for the following reasons: (1) To be more consistent with the principles espoused in the Division III philosophy statement; to award no athletically related financial aid to any student; and ensure that athletics participants are not treated differently from other members of the student body; (2) To eliminate the award review process for awards of circumstance and nonathletics achievement awards; (3) To retain and enforce consistent financial aid package requirements; and (4) To ensure athletics department staff members are not involved with arranging or modifying a student-athlete's financial aid package. A formal compliance process, effective August 1, 2002, will be created at a later date.

**Action:** Adopted as amended, 318-26-1.

#### **\*NO. 46-1**

#### **FINANCIAL AID REGULATIONS**

**Intent:** To delay the effective date of Proposal No. 46 until August 1, 2002.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 46, effective date, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

**Effective Date:** *August 1, 2001.* **August 1, 2002.**

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council.

**Rationale:** The delayed effective date will provide additional time to permit the Financial Aid and Awards Committee to develop comprehensive compliance and enforcement processes and communicate those details to the membership.

**Action:** Adopted, 339-2-0.

**NO. 46-2**

**APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL AID COMPLIANCE PROCESS**

[Division III, roll call]

*"Whereas, the Division III Financial Aid and Awards Committee has concluded that significant revisions to NCAA Bylaw 15 are desirable to more effectively and efficiently ensure institutional compliance with the Division III philosophy and the fundamental principles of Division III financial aid; and*

*"Whereas, upon the recommendation of the Division III Financial Aid and Awards Committee and the Division III Management Council, the Division III Presidents Council is sponsoring 2001 NCAA Convention Proposal Nos. 46 and 46-1 to address this issue; and*

*"Whereas, the Presidents Council, Management Council, and Financial Aid and Awards Committee have expressed their intent to create a formal compliance and enforcement process, effective August 1, 2002, related to Proposal Nos. 46 and 46-1; and*

*"Whereas, Division III institutions maintain student aid programs that process hundreds, and in many cases thousands, of individual financial aid awards to prospective students each year; and*

*"Whereas, a formal compliance and enforcement process regarding financial aid awards, depending upon its specific requirements, has the potential to create substantial demands on the staff and resources of member institutions given the volume and complexity of their student aid programs; and*

*"Whereas, the positive changes to Bylaw 15 contained in Proposal Nos. 46 and 46-1, which are intended to simplify the Division III financial aid legislation, do not include any specifics with regard to the formal compliance and enforcement process suggested in the rationale statement of the proposal;*

*"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Financial Aid and Awards Committee discuss and articulate by June 1, 2001, the formal compliance and enforcement process intended to implement Proposal Nos. 46 and 46-1; and*

*"Be It Further Resolved, that the Division III Management and Presidents Councils forward appropriate legislation to the Division III membership for consideration at the 2002 NCAA Convention to implement the formal compliance and enforcement process related to Proposal Nos. 46 and 46-1."*

**Source:** All members of the University Athletic Association and NCAA Division III Presidents Council.

**Action:** Adopted, 340-4-0.

**NO. 47 (NO. 2-48)****ELIGIBILITY – MINIMUM AMOUNT  
OF PARTICIPATION**

**Intent:** To eliminate "redshirting" in Division III intercollegiate athletics by specifying that any athletics participation during or after the start of the first regular-season contest shall exhaust a season of eligibility.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.2.4.1, page 95, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"14.2.4.1 Minimum Amount of *Competition Participation*. A season of *competition participation* (see 14.02.8) shall be counted when a student-athlete participates (i.e., **practices or competes**) *in any regular-season or postseason intercollegiate competition during or after the start of the first regular-season contest*. This provision is applicable to intercollegiate athletics *competition participation* conducted by a two-year or four-year collegiate institution at the varsity or subvarsity level."

[Remainder of 14.2.4.1 unchanged]

**Source:** All members of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** "Redshirting" is purely an athletically focused act contrary to the philosophy of Division III. If a student merely attends the first day of class while registered full time, a semester or quarter is charged against his or her 10-semester/15-quarter eligibility clock. However, a student also may practice with a team, attend all of the contests for a complete season and not be charged with a season of competition. This same student may step on the field, court track or in the pool, for the briefest of moments during a contest and be charged a season of competition. These situations represent a contradiction in how the Division III philosophy is practically applied. We have seen numerous examples in which student-athletes have extended their academic careers to enable their continued participation in intercollegiate athletics. While this practice is permissible under current legislation, it was certainly not the intent of the legislation to permit student-athletes to delay "normal progress" toward a degree by manipulating their academic-course load for the purpose of athletics participation.

**Council Position** (Division III Presidents Council): The Presidents Council supports this proposal.

**Action:** Failed, 115-237-4.

**NO. 48 (NO. 2-50)****PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS –  
PRACTICE AND COMPETITION IN  
THE NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT**



**Intent:** To permit an institution to conduct practices supervised by coaches or captain's practices (but not both) on two days during a given week and participate in competition on a weekend day (e.g., Saturday, Sunday) during a four-week period in the nontraditional segment.

[Note: This proposal is presented in a nontraditional format. Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in Bylaw 17 to reflect the adoption of this legislation. The Bylaw is shown only to illustrate the recommended revisions.]

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.\_1, pages 138-207, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.\_1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season in \_\_\_\_ shall be limited to the following:

"(b) Division III—A maximum of 21 weeks (traditional and nontraditional segments combined). **The nontraditional segment may not be longer than four weeks in length. Each week, an institution may conduct supervised practices or captain's practices [see Bylaw 17.02.1.1-(j)] (but not both) on two weekdays per week and may engage in one day of competition each weekend during the four-week nontraditional segment.**"

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.\_3, pages 138-207, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.\_3 First Contest Date. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in \_\_\_\_ prior to the following dates:

"(b) Division III

"(1) Traditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

"(2) Nontraditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.  
**An institution may participate in one day of competition each weekend during the four-week period in the nontraditional segment.**"

**Source:** All members of the Great Northeast Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** This proposal will reduce the demands and challenges placed on institutional resources and personnel while preserving the benefit and value of practice opportunities as well as game competition. The associated guidelines provide both support and control of nontraditional segment activities. Student-athletes, by means of their national student councils, have endorsed the value of a nontraditional season, as have coaches from institutions that are challenged by climate and geography in squad-selection evaluations. In accordance with NCAA Bylaw 17.1.9.3, a member institution that conducts its nontraditional golf and tennis segment in the fall and

schedules more than 50 percent of its contests or dates of competition (including the conference championship) in the nontraditional segment may continue to use the preseason practice and first date-of-competition legislation applicable to the traditional segment.

**Committee Position** (Division III Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The subcommittee opposes this proposal. First, the subcommittee expressed concern regarding the impact of this proposal on the sports of golf and tennis. Second, the limit of two practices per week may not allow sufficient preparation for weekend competition. Third, the subcommittee notes possible liability and interpretive issues related to captain's practices.

**Action:** Failed, 34-322-0.

**\*NO. 49 (NO. 2-52)      MAXIMUM DATES OF COMPETITION  
– BASEBALL AND SOFTBALL**

**Intent:** To eliminate the current legislation permitting baseball and softball tournaments to count as one contest and to specify that the maximum number of contests in the sports of baseball and softball is 40 in the traditional segment and five in the nontraditional segment.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.4.5.1, page 143, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.4.5.1 Maximum Limitations-Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of baseball during the institution's baseball playing season to 45 contests (games and scrimmages) with not more than **36 40** during the traditional segment, except for those contests excluded under Bylaw 17.4.5."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.4.5.1.1, page 143, as follows:

[Division III]

*"17.4.5.1.1 Tournament Dates. Each date of a baseball tournament shall be counted as one contest, provided not more than two tournaments fall under this provision during an academic year."*

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.4.5.2, page 143, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.4.5.2 Maximum Limitations-Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in a maximum of 45 baseball contests with not more than **36 40** during the traditional segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student-athlete represents the institution including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8."

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 17.19.5.1, page 181, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.19.5.1 Maximum Limitations-Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of softball during the institution's softball-playing season to a maximum of 45 contests (games and scrimmages) with not more than 36 40 during the traditional segment, except for those contests excluded under Bylaw 17.19.5.3."

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 17.19.5.1.1, page 181, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

*"17.19.5.1.1 Tournament Dates. Each date of a softball tournament shall be counted as one contest, provided not more than two tournaments fall under this provision during an academic year."*

**F. Bylaws:** Amend 17.19.5.2, page 181, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.19.5.2 Maximum Limitations-Student-Athlete. A student-athlete may participate in each academic year in a maximum of 45 softball contests, with not more than 36 40 during the traditional segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8."

**G. Bylaws:** Amend 17.19.5.2.1, page 181, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

*"17.19.5.2.1 Tournament Dates. Each date of a softball tournament shall be counted as one contest, provided not more than two tournaments fall under this provision during an academic year."*

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The proposal eliminates the current baseball and softball-tournament-dates legislation, which permits an institution to count each date of a tournament as one contest regardless of the number of contests played on that date. With the deletion of this tournament-dates exception, institutions no longer will be able to compete in more than 40 contests during the traditional segment, except for contests that are exempt annually from the maximum number of contests per Bylaws 17.4.5.3 and 17.19.5.3. This proposal also decreases the maximum number of baseball and softball contests that an institution may play during the nontraditional segment, while maintaining the overall total current maximum number of contests.

**Action:** Adopted, 182-167-5. [Motion to refer the proposal back to the Division III Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee failed, 140-212-3. Motion to reconsider the proposal during the window of reconsideration failed, 151-168-3.]

**Intent:** To place playing and practice limitations on the sports of baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball and women's volleyball, as specified.

- A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.1.6 by adding new 17.1.6.1, page 134, as follows:  
[Division III]

**"17.1.6.1 Missed Class Time for Competition in the Nontraditional Segment – Baseball, Field Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer, Softball and Women's Volleyball. In the sports of baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball and women's volleyball, no class time may be missed for competition during the nontraditional segment."**

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.1.9 by adding new 17.1.9.4, page 135, as follows:  
[Division III]

**"17.1.9.4 Traditional and Nontraditional Segment Length – Baseball, Field Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer, Softball and Women's Volleyball. All practice and competition during the nontraditional segment shall be limited to a maximum of five weeks."**

- C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.4.5.1 and 17.4.5.2, page 143, as follows:  
[Division III]

**"17.4.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of baseball during the institution's baseball-playing season to 45 contests (games and scrimmages) with not more than 36 40 during the traditional segment and not more than five during the nontraditional segment, except for those contests excluded under Bylaw 17.4.5**

[Remainder of 17.4.5.1 unchanged]

**"17.4.5.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in a maximum of 45 baseball contests with not more than 36 40 during the traditional segment and not more than five during the nontraditional segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student-athlete represents the institution including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8."**

- D. Bylaws:** Amend 17.4.5.1.1, page 143, as follows:  
[Division III]

"17.4.5.1.1 Tournament Dates. Each date of a baseball tournament shall be counted as one contest, provided not more than *two one* tournaments falls under this provision during an academic year. **Further, the tournament must be held during the institution's vacation or break when classes are not in session.**"

- E. Bylaws:** Amend 17.9.5.1 and 17.9.5.2, pages 155-156, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.9.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of field hockey during the institution's field hockey playing season in any one year to 20 contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and *five four* dates of competition during another segment, except for those contests or dates of competition excluded under 17.9.5.3, 17.9.5.4 and 17.9.5.8:

[Remainder of 17.9.5.1 unchanged]

"17.9.5.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 20 field hockey contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and *five four* dates of competition in field hockey during another segment. This limitation includes those contests or dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution."

- F. Bylaws:** Amend 17.18.5.1 and 17.18.5.1.2, page 178, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.18.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of soccer during the institution's soccer playing season in any one year to a maximum of 20 contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and *five four* dates of competition during another segment, except for those contests and/or dates of competition excluded under 17.18.5.3, 17.18.5.4 and 17.18.5.5.

[Remainder of 17.18.5.1 unchanged]

"17.18.5.1.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. A student-athlete may participate in each academic year in a maximum of 20 soccer contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and *five four* dates of competition in soccer during another segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8."

- G. Bylaws:** Amend 17.19.5.1 and 17.19.5.2, page 181, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.19.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of softball during the institution's softball playing season to a maximum of 45 contests (games and scrimmages) with not more than **36 40** during the traditional segment **and not more than five during the nontraditional segment**, except for those contests excluded under Bylaw 17.19.5.3:

"17.19.5.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. A student-athlete may participate in each academic year in a maximum of 45 softball contests, with not more than **36 40** during the traditional segment **and not more than five during the nontraditional segment**. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8."

- H. Bylaws:** Amend 17.19.5.1.1, page 199, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.19.5.1.1 Tournament Dates. Each date of a softball tournament shall be counted as one contest, provided not more than *two one* tournaments falls under this provision during an academic year. **Further, the tournament must be held during the institution's vacation or break period when classes are not in session.**"

- I. Bylaws:** Amend 17.19.5.2.1, page 199, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.19.5.2.1 Tournament Dates. Each date of a softball tournament shall be counted as one contest, provided not more than *two one* tournaments falls under this provision during an academic year. **Further, the tournament must be held during the institution's vacation or break period when classes are not in session.**"

- J. Bylaws:** Amend 17.26.8.1 and 17.26.8.2, page 199, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.26.8.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of women's volleyball during the institution's women's volleyball playing season to a maximum of 22 dates of competition during the traditional segment and *five four* during the nontraditional segment, except for those dates of competition excluded under Bylaw 17.26.9.

"17.26.8.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete—Women. An individual student-athlete may participate each academic year in a maximum of 22 dates of competition during the traditional segment and *five four* during the nontraditional segment in women's volleyball. This limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student-athlete represents the institution, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution in accordance with Bylaws 17.02.4 and 17.02.8."

**Source:** All members of the New Jersey Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** While the traditional segment should be the primary time to focus on practice and competition, allowing both practice and competition during the nontraditional segments offers many benefits to student-athletes. This proposal balances the concerns of the Presidents Council with the wishes of the student-athletes as expressed at the 2000 Convention. It also seeks to accommodate the broad range of approaches to the Division III philosophy practiced by individual institutions with regard to the nontraditional season. By decreasing the permissible number of contests, limiting the number of weeks of practice and competition and prohibiting any missed class time, this proposal addresses the needs and interests of all three constituents. This proposal has been amended after careful consideration of feedback provided by the Presidents Council, baseball and softball coaches, and other Division III institutions. This modification incorporates revisions regarding the maximum contest limitations for baseball and softball, with one exception: it retains the exemption of a single tournament, with the provision that no class time may be missed. By decreasing the tournament exemption from two to one, it addresses the need to place limits on dates of competition without placing hardship on those schools in northern climates to play a full competitive schedule.

**Committee Position** (Division III Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The subcommittee supports this proposal but prefers the baseball and softball restrictions set forth in Proposal No. 49.

**Action:** Adopted, 279-54-6.

**NO. 51 (NO. 2-53)      FIRST PERMISSIBLE PRACTICE DATE  
– BASKETBALL**

**Intent:** To specify that an institution may commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions on October 15.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.5.2.1, page 145, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.5.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions before the fourth Saturday preceding the first permissible contest date *per Bylaw 17.5.3-(d) October 15.*"

**Source:** All members of the American Southwest Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** This proposal will simplify and standardize the start of preseason on-court basketball practice to prevent incorrect interpretations of the current rule. Establishing a standard start date of October 15 will make the rule easier to interpret and help avoid

numerous questions each year as to the actual starting date for basketball practice.

**Committee Position** (Division III Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The subcommittee supports this proposal. The subcommittee noted that this proposal would establish a more uniform and easily understood starting date for practice. It also would help limit the additional informal basketball practice activities in which student-athletes often participate during the current conditioning period.

**Action:** Adopted, 211-141-2.

<b>*NO. 52 (NO. 2-54)</b>	<b>CONTEST EXEMPTIONS – SEASON-ENDING TOURNAMENT – BASKETBALL</b>
---------------------------	---

**Intent:** To exempt contests annually played in a conference championship tournament in the sport of basketball.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.5.5.1.1, page 146, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

*"17.5.5.1.1 Conference Season-Ending Tournament. If a conference conducts a regularly scheduled, season-ending, single-elimination basketball championship tournament (or the tournament used to determine the conference's automatic entry in the NCAA basketball tournament), which may include one additional contest to determine third place, among some or all of its members, the game or games played by each team shall count as one of the permissible regular-season contests as specified in Bylaw 17.5.5, and the tournament shall not be considered postseason."*

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.5.5.3, page 146, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.5.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests shall exclude the following:

[17.5.5.3-(a) and 17.5.5.3-(b) unchanged]

**"(c) Conference Championship. Competition in one conference championship tournament or the tournament used to determine the conference's automatic entry in the NCAA basketball championship;"**

[17.5.5.3-(c) through 17.5.5.3-(f) relettered 17.5.5.3-(d) through 17.5.5.3-(g), unchanged]

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.



**Rationale:** Current legislation requires contests played in a season-ending conference tournament in the sport of basketball to count as one contest toward the institutional maximum number of contest limitations. In all other sports, similar contests are exempt from the maximum number of contests. This proposal will apply the same standard to the sport of basketball.

**Action:** Adopted, 314-40-0.

NO. 53 (NO. 2-58)	FIRST PERMISSIBLE CONTEST DATE – FOOTBALL
-------------------	---

**Intent:** To permit an institution to play its first football contest on the Thursday prior to the Labor Day weekend.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.10.3, page 158, as follows:

[Division III, roll call football only]

"17.10.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game) with outside competition in football before the Thursday preceding Labor Day except when selected to participate in the National Football Foundation benefit game or the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game; both sponsored by the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics, and played in the week prior to the beginning of the regular playing season in football. *A member institution shall not play its first contest (game) with outside competition in football before the Friday or Saturday 11 weeks before the first round of the Division III Football Championship.*"

**Source:** All members of the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Football scheduling is becoming increasingly more difficult for institutions in certain regions of the country and many of those institutions are forced to travel considerable distances in order to fill out their schedules. Allowing institutions to play their first permissible game on the Thursday prior to Labor Day would provide greater flexibility in scheduling which often results in lower costs and less missed class time for student-athletes. Since a number of institutions do not begin classes for the fall term until after the Labor Day weekend, playing a game on the preceding Thursday would not result in any missed class time for those institutions. Furthermore, for those institutions that find it necessary to schedule Division II opponents, this modification would make the first permissible contest date for Division III consistent with that for Division II; thereby increasing the opportunities to schedule games closer to home. It also is important to note that this is permissive legislation enabling an institution to elect to play its first game on a date that results in the least amount of missed class time for its student-athletes and at a considerable cost savings.

**Committee Position** (Division III Management Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The subcommittee opposes this proposal. The subcommittee noted that this proposal would lengthen the football season and could have a negative impact on an institution's academic calendar if the first contest were conducted from home.

**Action:** Failed, 51-124-10.

**NO. 54 (NO. 2-57)      THREE-DAY NONCONTACT,  
CONDITIONING PRACTICE PERIOD -  
FOOTBALL**

**Intent:** To permit the use of shoulder pads during the three-day, non-contact, conditioning practice period in football.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.10.2.2, page 158, as follows:

[Division III, roll call football only]

"17.10.2.2 Three-Day, Noncontact, Conditioning Practice Period. Physical activity during the first three days of the preseason practice period shall be limited to noncontact, conditioning drills. No football gear or protective equipment other than headgear, **shoulder pads**, shoes, pants and porous, lightweight jerseys shall be worn by players during practice sessions in this three-day period."

**Source:** All members of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic and Ohio Athletic Conferences.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The first three days of preseason practice are crucial in getting players acclimated and focused for the upcoming season. The existing rule already prohibits contact; however, drills involving contact with other players are not necessary for players to sustain injuries. Any player that makes contact with the ground while running without shoulder pads risks injury. This time period also allows for skill development in conjunction with conditioning. Allowing players to wear shoulder pads while practicing these skills further aids in their development under more realistic conditions and provides for the use of more protective equipment.

**Committee Position** (Division III Management Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The subcommittee opposes this proposal. The subcommittee noted that the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports has opposed this proposal in the past based on the following reasons: (1) Having student-athletes wear shoulder pads increases the likelihood of contact activities; (2) NCAA Injury Surveillance System data do not support that wearing shoulder pads in a noncontact setting reduces the risk from shoulder injury; and (3) Wearing shoulder pads hinders the body's ability to dissipate heat during the three-day noncontact period, which is an extremely important time to properly acclimate the body to increased temperatures.

**Action:** Failed, 82-100-1.

---

## GENERAL

### **\*NO. 55 (NO. 2-59)      DIVISION III CHAMPIONSHIPS – MINIMUM NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS**

**Intent:** To specify that at least 28 institutions must sponsor the sport in order to create a Division III championship in an emerging women's team sport.

**Bylaws:** Amend 18.2.4.1 by adding new 18.2.4.1.1, page 210, as follows:  
[Division III]

"18.2.4.1 Exception for Women's Sports during the 1994-95 through 2003-04 Academic Years. A National Collegiate Championship or a division championship may be established during the 1994-95 through 2003-04 academic years in women's sport in which the Association does not already conduct a championship if at least 40 institutions sponsor the sport.

*"18.2.4.1.1 Exception – Establishment of Division III Championship. A Division III championship in an emerging women's team sport may be sponsored if at least 28 institutions sponsor the sport."*

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** This legislation creates new requirements for establishing a championship in women's emerging team sports, thus, providing more championship opportunities sooner for Division III female student-athletes. Current legislation requires at least 40 institutions to sponsor the sport in order to create a National Collegiate Championship. Moreover, if the legislation is adopted, a Division III Women's Ice Hockey Championship may be established as early as 2001-02.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

### **\*NO. 56 (NO. 2-60)      DIVISION III CHAMPIONSHIPS – WOMEN'S ROWING**

**Intent:** To establish an NCAA Division III Women's Rowing Championship and to establish a Division III Women's Rowing Committee as specified.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 18.3.4, page 212, as follows:  
[Division III]

"18.3.4 National Collegiate Division III Championships (25) (26)

"Men (13)

Women (12) (13)

Baseball

Basketball

Basketball

Cross Country

Cross Country

Field Hockey

Football

Golf

Golf

Ice Hockey

Lacrosse

Lacrosse

Soccer

**Rowing**

Soccer

Softball

Swimming and Diving

Swimming and Diving

Tennis

Tennis

Indoor Track and Field

Indoor Track and Field

Outdoor Track and Field

Outdoor Track and Field

Wrestling

Volleyball"

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 21.8.7 by adding a new 21.8.7.15, page 248, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division III]

**"21.8.7.15 Rowing Committee, Division III Women's. The women's rowing committee shall consist of six members. One member shall be selected from each of the Division III women's rowing regions."**

[21.8.7.15 through 21.8.7.22 renumbered as 21.8.7.16 through 21.8.7.23, unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Forty-one Division III institutions currently sponsor women's rowing. The sport meets the current legislative requirements to establish a division specific championship. The establishment of a rowing championship would create additional competitive opportunities for female student-athletes.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

**\*NO. 57 (NO. 2-61)**

**DIVISION III CHAMPIONSHIPS –  
WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY**

**Intent:** To establish an NCAA Division III Women's Ice Hockey Championship and to create a Division III Women's Ice Hockey Committee.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 18.3.4, page 212, as follows:

[Division III]

"18.3.4 National Collegiate Division III Championship (25) **(26)**

"Men (13)

Women (12) **(13)**

Baseball

Basketball

Basketball

Cross Country

Cross Country

Field Hockey

Football

Golf

Golf

**Ice Hockey**

Ice Hockey

Lacrosse

Lacrosse

Soccer

Soccer

Softball

Swimming and Diving

Swimming and Diving

Tennis

Tennis

Indoor Track and Field

Indoor Track and Field

Outdoor Track and Field

Outdoor Track and Field

Wrestling

Volleyball"

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 21.8.7 by adding new 21.8.7.13, page 248, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division III]

[21.8.7.1 through 21.8.7.12 unchanged.]

**"21.8.7.13 Ice Hockey Committee, Division III Women's. The women's ice hockey committee shall consist of six representatives."**

[21.8.7.13 through 21.8.7.22 renumbered as 21.8.7.14 through 21.8.7.23, unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Thirty-two Division III institutions currently sponsor women's ice hockey. If legislation is adopted to reduce the number of institutions currently required to establish a Division III championship in a women's emerging team sport (from 40 to 28), a Division III Women's Ice Hockey Championship could be established. This legislation provides additional championship opportunities to Division III female athletes. The regional composition of the committee will be established at a later date.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

**\*NO. 58 (NO. 2-46)**

**ETHICAL CONDUCT - GAMBLING  
ACTIVITIES**

**Intent:** To establish a two-tiered eligibility-reinstatement process for student-athletes who violate NCAA gambling/sports wagering legislation, as specified.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 10.3 by adding new 10.3.1, page 50, as follows:

[Division III]

**"10.3.1 Sanctions. The following sanctions for violations of Bylaw 10.3 shall apply:**

**"(a) A student-athlete who engages in activities designed to influence the outcome of an intercollegiate contest or in an effort to affect win-loss margins (i.e., "point shaving") or who solicits or accepts a bet or participates in any gambling activity through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling that involves wagering on the student-athlete's institution shall permanently lose all remaining regular season and postseason eligibility in all sports.**

**"(b) A student-athlete who solicits or accepts a bet or participates in any gambling activity that involves intercollegiate athletics or professional athletics, through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling, shall be ineligible for all regular-season and postseason competition for a minimum of a period of one year from the date of the institution's determination that a violation has occurred and shall be charged with a loss of a minimum of one season of competition. A request for reinstatement may be submitted on behalf of a student-athlete who has participated in such activity only upon fulfillment of the minimum condition indicated above. If the student-athlete is determined to have been involved in a subsequent violation of any portion of Bylaw 10.3, the student-athlete shall permanently lose all remaining regular-season and postseason eligibility in all sports."**

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 10.4, page 50, as follows:

[Division III]

**"10.4 DISCIPLINARY ACTION**

**"Prospective student-athletes found in violation of the provisions of this regulation shall be ineligible for further intercollegiate competition, subject to appeal to the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement for restoration of eligibility. (See 10.3.1 for sanctions of student-athletes involved in violations of 10.3.)** Institutional staff members found in violation of the provisions of this regulation shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in Bylaw 19.6.2.2 of the NCAA enforcement procedures, whether such violations occurred at the certifying institution or during the individual's previous employment at another member institution."

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The proposed increase in sanctions for gambling/sports wagering violations is designed to address what continues to be a serious threat to the fabric of intercollegiate athletics. This proposal will address such concerns by providing more defined stringent sanctions for specific violations based on the severity of the activity. It is hoped that the publication of such penalties in conjunction with a more rigorous educational process that involves the entire collegiate community will serve to minimize the involvement of coaches and basketball student-athletes in all types of gambling activities. This proposal would not penalize informal gambling activity, which is less dangerous to intercollegiate athletics than organized gambling, and is much more common place in our culture. Additionally, fair and consistent enforcement of rules applicable to informal gambling activity would be very difficult.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

**\*NO. 59 (NO. 2-45) MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS –  
FIVE-SPORT/THREE-SEASON  
REQUIREMENT – PENALTY**

**Intent:** To specify that an institution that fails to meet the five-sport/three-season requirement shall be placed on probation for one year, moved to restricted membership if the requirement is still not satisfied after the second year and, finally, reclassified to corresponding membership if the requirement is still not satisfied after the third year.

**Constitution:** Amend 3.2.5.2, page 12, as follows:

[Division III]

"3.2.5.2 Failure to Meet *Four* **Five-Sport/Three-Season** Requirement. If an active member no longer meets the *four* **five-sport/three-season** requirement for either men or women, its **entire program (both men's and women's sports)** shall be *reclassified immediately as a corresponding member* **placed on probation for one year beginning in the next academic year after noncompliance is discovered. An institution shall be afforded the one-year probationary period for failure to comply with the criteria only once in a 10-year period. The 10-year period shall begin the September 1 following completion of the academic year in which the membership criterion is not met.**

"3.2.5.2.1 **Application of Restricted Membership Status.** If an institution fails to meet the five-sport/three-season requirement at the end of the probationary year or is ineligible for the once-in-10-year probationary period, it shall be placed in restricted membership and its entire program (both men's and women's sports) shall not be

eligible for NCAA championship competition in the first academic year after the probationary year (or the first academic year after failure to meet the requirements if the institution is ineligible for the once-in-10-year probationary period). If the institution still cannot certify compliance with the five-sport/three-season requirement at the end of that year, it shall be reclassified as a corresponding member."

[3.2.5.2.1 renumbered as 3.2.5.2.2, unchanged]

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** An institution that fails to meet the current five-sport/three-season requirement immediately is reclassified as a corresponding member. This proposal will make the penalty for not meeting the five-sport/three-season requirement (effective August 1, 2001) consistent with the penalty associated with the failure to meet Division III sports-sponsorship requirements (i.e., the minimum number of sports for each gender).

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

**\*NO. 60 (NO. 2-62) ENFORCEMENT – PENALTIES FOR MAJOR VIOLATIONS**

**Intent:** To permit the Committee on Infractions to impose financial penalties in cases involving findings of major violations of NCAA legislation.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 19.6.2.2, pages 219-220, as follows:  
[Division III]

"19.6.2.2 Disciplinary Measures. In addition to those penalties prescribed for secondary violations, among the disciplinary measures, singly or in combination, that may be adopted by the committee (or the appropriate appeals committee per 19.3) and imposed against an institution for major violations are:

[19.6.2.2-(a) through 19.6.2.2-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) **One or more** *All or any combination* of the following penalties:

"(1) Individual records and performances shall be vacated or stricken, or

"(2) Team records and performances shall be vacated or stricken, or

"(3) Individual or team awards shall be returned to the Association;

"(f) **A financial penalty;**

(g) *Forfeiture of all or a portion of the institution's share of the broad-based revenue distribution moneys for a specific period.*



[19.6.2.2-(h) through 19.6.2.2.2-(l) relettered as 19.6.2.2.2-(g) through 19.6.2.2.2-(l), unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 19.8, page 222, as follows:

[Division III]

"19.8 RESTITUTION.

"If a student-athlete who is ineligible under the terms of the constitution, bylaws or other legislation of the Association is permitted to participate in intercollegiate competition contrary to such NCAA legislation but in accordance with the terms of a court restraining order or injunction operative against the institution attended by such student-athlete or against the Association, or both, and said injunction is subsequently voluntarily vacated, stayed or reversed or it is finally determined by the courts that injunctive relief is not or was not justified, the Management Council may take any one or more of the following actions against such institution in the interest of restitution and fairness to competing institutions:

[19.8-(a) through 19.8-(h) unchanged.]

- "(i) Require that the institution that has been represented in an NCAA championship by such a student-athlete *shall return 90 percent of its share of the net receipts from such competition in excess of the regular expense reimbursement, or if said funds have not been distributed, require that they be withheld by the president be assessed a financial penalty as determined by the appropriate divisional Committee on Infractions in that division.*"

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 31.2.2.5, page 268, as follows:

"31.2.2.5 Institutional Penalty for Ineligible Participation. When an ineligible student-athlete participates in an NCAA championship and the student-athlete or the institution knew or had reason to know of the ineligibility, the *NCAA president appropriate divisional Committee on Infractions may withhold an amount to be determined by the Championships/Competition Cabinet (not to exceed 90 percent of the institution's share of revenue distribution in excess of the regular expense reimbursement). If said funds have been distributed, the institution may be required to return such an amount. [Note: In appropriate cases, in accordance with 19.6.2.2-(e) or 19.8 of the NCAA enforcement program, an institution may not be permitted to receive or may be required to reimburse the Association an amount equal to 90 percent of its share of the revenue distribution.] assess a financial penalty.*"

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Infractions)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** In some instances involving findings of major violations of NCAA legislation, it would be appropriate for the Committee on Infractions to impose financial penalties in the form of fines. Current legislation does not allow for such a penalty upon findings of major

violations. Monetary fines, however, may be assessed in secondary violations pursuant to Bylaw 19.6.1-(d). Currently, the only circumstance in which the Committee on Infractions may impose upon an institution a monetary penalty in a major infractions case relates to championship competition. The "90-percent rule" permits the Committee on Infractions to recommend to the Championships Committee that an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the institution's share of revenue distribution in excess of the regular expense reimbursement be withheld in situations in which an ineligible student-athlete participated in championship competition. Amending the legislation to substitute fines in lieu of the "90-percent rule" would avoid future confusion in all divisions. Allowing the Committee on Infractions to impose reasonable fines when violations are found in certain major infractions cases will provide an appropriate and viable penalty option that currently exists only for findings of violations in secondary infractions cases.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

**\*NO. 61 (NO. 2-47) 10-SEMESTER/15-QUARTER EXTENSION REQUEST – ELIGIBILITY FOR PRACTICE**

**Intent:** To permit a student-athlete who has exhausted his or her 10-semester/15-quarters of eligibility to practice, but not compete, for 30 consecutive-calendar days provided the institution has filed a 10-semester/15-quarter extension waiver request per NCAA Bylaw 30.6.1 with the NCAA national office.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.2.3 by adding new 14.2.3.5, page 95, as follows:

[Division III]

"14.2.3.5 10-Semester/15-Quarter Extension Request. A student-athlete, who has exhausted his or her 10-semester/15-quarter period of eligibility may practice, but not compete, for 30 consecutive-calendar days, provided the institution has filed a 10-semester/15-quarter extension waiver request per Bylaw 30.6.1 with the NCAA national office."

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Permitting the student-athlete to practice for a maximum of 30 consecutive-calendar days will ensure that in those instances in which the extension waiver request is granted, the student-athlete would be prepared to engage in physical competition and would be less susceptible to injury. This legislation is designed with student-athletes' welfare in mind.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

**\*NO. 62 (NO. 2-55)      LENGTH OF PLAYING SEASON –  
NATIONAL COLLEGIATE SPORTS**

**Intent:** To specify that the sports of fencing, gymnastics, rifle, women's rowing, skiing, men's volleyball and water polo shall be limited to a playing and practice season of 21 weeks.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.8.1, page 153, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.8.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season in fencing shall be limited to a *144-day 21-week* season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only required off days per 17.1.7 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.12.1, page 163, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.12.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season in gymnastics shall be limited to a *144-day 21-week* season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only required off days per 17.1.7 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur."

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.15.1, page 171, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.15.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season in rifle shall be limited to a *144-day 21-week* season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only required off days per 17.1.7 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur."

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 17.16.1, page 173, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.16.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season in rowing shall be limited to a *156-day 21-week* season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only required off days per 17.1.7 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur."

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 17.17.1, page 175, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.17.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season in skiing shall be limited to a *144-day 21-week* season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only required off days per 17.1.7

and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur."

**F. Bylaws:** Amend 17.26.1-(b)-(1), page 198, as follows:

[Division III]

"(1) Men—A *132-day 21-week* season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only required off days per 17.1.7 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur."

**G. Bylaws:** Amend 17.27.1, page 201, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.27.1 Length of Playing Season. In all divisions, the length of an institution's playing season in water polo shall be limited to a *132-day 21-week* season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only required off days per 17.1.7 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur."

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** This proposal will ensure consistency that all Division III sports, including those which conclude with the National Collegiate Championship, are limited to a playing and practice season of 21 weeks. Currently, the sports of fencing, gymnastics, rifle, women's rowing, skiing, men's volleyball and water polo are not limited to the 21-week playing and practice season.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

**\*NO. 63 (NO. 2-56) OUT OF SEASON ATHLETICALLY  
RELATED ACTIVITIES – SUMMER  
WORKOUT SESSIONS**

**Intent:** To eliminate summer workout sessions in the sports of fencing, gymnastics, rifle, women's rowing and skiing.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.8.6.1.1, page 154, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.8.6.1.1 *Summer-Workout Sessions.* A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach's team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.12.6.1.1, page 165, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.12.6.1.1 *Summer-Workout Sessions.* A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach's

*team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility."*

- C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.15.6.1.1, page 172, as follows:

[Division III]

*"17.15.6.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach's team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility."*

- D. Bylaws:** Amend 17.16.6.1.1, page 174, as follows:

[Division III]

*"17.16.6.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach's team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility."*

- E. Bylaws:** Amend 17.17.6.1.1, pages 176-177, as follows:

[Division III]

*"17.17.6.1.1 Summer-Workout Sessions. A coach may participate in individual-workout sessions with student-athletes from the coach's team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. It is not permissible for the institution to pay fees for the use of a facility."*

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Current legislation permits summer workout sessions between coaches and student-athletes from the same institution in the sports of fencing, gymnastics, rifle, women's rowing and skiing. Summer workout sessions are not permitted in any other Division III sports. This proposal will standardize the out of season athletically related activities legislation to all Division III sports.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

---

## DIVISION III EMPLOYMENT DEREGULATION PACKAGE

*The NCAA Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee has identified the following 14 proposals to facilitate the deregulation of the Association's legislation. The NCAA Division III Presidents Council has approved the submission of these proposals to the membership as an "employment deregulation package." Thus, they will be voted on using a single vote unless a proposal is removed from the package.*

**NO. 64 (Dereg. 1)**

**CONDUCT AND EMPLOYMENT OF  
PERSONNEL – GENERAL PRINCIPLE**

**Intent:** To specify through the creation of a new general principle that member institutions shall determine whom to employ and the amount of compensation received by the employee.

**Bylaws:** Amend 11, by adding new 11.01, page 54, as follows:

[Division III]

**"11.01 General Principle**

**"11.01.1 Institutional Control. An institution determines who is to be employed and the amount of salary the employee receives in accordance with institutional policy."**

[11.01.1 and 11.01.2 renumbered as 11.01.2 and 11.01.3, unchanged]

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The committee agreed that, with all of the possible changes to NCAA Bylaw 11, it was important to create a new general principle for the employment of institutional personnel. This new principle clearly will state that personnel issues are to be handled through normal institutional channels rather than by NCAA legislation.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

**NO. 65 (Dereg. 2)**

**PERSONNEL – DEFINITIONS**

**Intent:** To delete the definitions of "bonus" and "supplemental pay" set forth in NCAA Bylaw 11 relating to compensation.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 11.01.1, page 51, as follows:

[Division III]

*"11.01.1 Bonus. A bonus is a direct cash payment over and above an athletics department staff member's institutional salary in recognition of a specific and extraordinary achievement (see 11.3.2.3.)."*

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 11.01.2, page 51, as follows:

[Division III]

*"11.01.2 Supplemental Pay. Supplemental pay is the payment of cash over and above an athletics department staff member's institutional salary by an outside source for the purpose of increasing that staff member's annual earnings (see 11.3.2.2)."*

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The committee has recommended the adoption of a new general principle, which specifies that the institution has complete control over who is to be employed and the amount of salary to be paid to that employee in accordance with institutional policy. Thus, these definitions are no longer necessary.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

<b>NO. 66 (Dereg. 3)</b>	<b>PERSONNEL – COMPENSATION LIMITS</b>
--------------------------	--

**Intent:** To eliminate the outside income restrictions for NCAA Division III coaches.

**Bylaws:** Amend 11.3.2, page 52, as follows:  
[Division III]

*"11.3.2 Income in Addition to Institutional Salary*

*"11.3.2.1 Bona Fide Outside Employment. A staff member may earn income in addition to the institutional salary by performing services for outside groups, provided the compensation is for additional work actually performed and at a rate commensurate with the going rate in that locality for services of like character; further, such outside work must be in conformity with institutional policy and with the approval of the institution. In Divisions I and II, athletically related income requires the prior written approval of the institution's chief executive officer (see 11.2.2).*

*"11.3.2.2 Supplemental Pay. An outside source is prohibited from paying or regularly supplementing an athletics department staff member's annual salary and from arranging to supplement that salary for an unspecified achievement. This includes the donation of cash from outside sources to the institution earmarked for the staff member's salary or supplemental income. It would be permissible for an outside source to donate funds to the institution to be used as determined by the institution, and it would be permissible for the institution, at its sole discretion, to use such funds to pay or supplement a staff member's salary.*

*"11.3.2.3 Bonuses for Specific and Extraordinary Achievement. An institution may permit an outside individual, group or agency to supplement an athletics department staff member's salary with a direct cash payment in recognition of a specific and extraordinary achievement (e.g., contribution during career to the athletics department of the institution, winning a conference or national championship, number of games or meets won during career/season), provided such a cash supplement is in recognition of a specific achievement and is in conformance with institutional policy.*

*"11.3.2.4 Extra Compensation Restriction for Division II and Division III Coaches. A member institution shall not give extra compensation or remuneration of any sort to any coach*

*conditioned upon or because of the number of games the coach's team wins, or because the team goes to a bowl game or tournament or participates in championships. These limitations on extra compensation to coaches do not apply where enforceable contracts or formal security-of-employment commitments in effect on August 15, 1976, make it impossible to comply with the limitations. These exceptions are continued until existing contracts or formal security-of-employment commitments expire.*

*"11.3.2.5 Promotional Activities. A staff member of a member institution's athletics department may not be compensated by an individual or commercial business outside of the institution for employment or assistance in the production, distribution or sale of items (e.g., calendars, pictures, posters, advertisements, cards) bearing the names or pictures of student-athletes. The use of the names or pictures of student-athletes on promotional items is limited to institutionally controlled activities involving the sale of official institutional publications and team or individual pictures by the institution. This restriction shall apply even if the promotional item is provided without charge to the public by an outside individual or commercial business that produces or purchases the item through the assistance of the institution's staff member.*

*"11.3.2.6 Compensation in Exchange for Use of Merchandise. Staff members of a member institution's athletics department shall not accept, prior to receiving approval (in writing in Divisions I and II) from the institution's chief executive officer, compensation or gratuities (excluding institutionally administered funds) from an athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturer in exchange for the use of such merchandise during practice or competition by the institution's student-athletes.*

*"11.3.2.7 Compensation for Scheduling Contests/Individual Participation. Staff members of a member institution's athletics department shall not accept compensation or gratuities for scheduling athletics contests or individual meet participation with another institution or a sponsor of athletics competition. This specifically precludes the acceptance of compensation or gratuities from other institutions, schedule brokers or agents, and television networks or syndicators. Staff members shall not accept compensation for personal appearances (e.g., speaking engagements, clinicians) held in conjunction with the competition in which the institution's team is a participant. A coach may receive a participatory gift from the sponsor of an event similar to the gift awarded to student-athletes participating in the event, provided the gift meets the applicable awards limitation set forth in 16.1.4."*

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.



**Rationale:** The committee has recommended the adoption of a new general principle, which specifies that the institution has complete control over who is to be employed and the amount of salary to be paid to that employee in accordance with institutional policy. Thus, this legislation is no longer necessary.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

**NO. 67 (Dereg. 4)      PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES –  
PRIVATELY OWNED SUMMER CAMP**

**Intent:** To specify that a privately owned summer camp may use the name or picture of a student-athlete employed as a camp counselor to publicize or promote the camp.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 12.5.1.7, page 64, as follows:

[Division III]

*"12.5.1.7 Institutionally Sponsored Institutional and Privately Owned Summer Camps. A member institution's or a privately owned summer camp may use the name or picture of any student-athlete employed as a counselor to publicize or promote the camp, including the use of the student-athlete's name or picture in camp brochures or other advertising."*

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 12.5.1.8, page 65, as follows:

[Division III]

*"12.5.1.8 Privately Owned Summer Camps. A privately owned summer camp may use a student-athlete's name, picture and institutional affiliation in its summer-camp brochure to identify the student-athlete as a staff member. However, a student-athlete's name or picture may not be used in any other way to directly advertise or promote the camp."*

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** This proposal will standardize the legislation relating to the use of a student-athlete's name or picture by an institutional camp and a privately owned summer camp. Further, it will allow a privately owned summer camp to use a student-athlete's name or picture to publicize or promote the camp to the same extent as an institutional summer camp.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

**NO. 68 (Dereg. 5)      MEDIA ACTIVITIES**

**Intent:** To clarify legislation relating to a student-athlete receiving legitimate and normal expenses while participating in media activities.

**Bylaws:** Amend 12.5.3, page 66, as follows:

[Division III]

"12.5.3 Media Activities. A student-athlete may participate in media activities (e.g., appearance on radio, television, in films or stage productions, or participate in writing projects) **and may receive legitimate and normal expenses** when the student-athlete's appearance or participation is related in any way to athletics ability or prestige. *A student-athlete may receive legitimate and normal expenses directly related to such an appearance or participation.* The student-athlete may engage in such activities at any time and may receive compensation at a rate commensurate with the going rate in that locale for similar services. Further, the student-athlete's name may be used to advertise his or her participation in such activity, provided the student-athlete's status as a student-athlete is not used for promotional purposes."

**Source:** NCAA Division III President Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The committee agreed that this revision will clarify the current legislation. This proposal does not change the current application of this legislation. It only is an attempt to make the current legislation easier to understand.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

## **NO. 69 (Dereg. 6) RECRUITING – TALENT SCOUT**

**Intent:** To eliminate the prohibition on an institution paying expenses incurred by a talent scout or a representative of athletics interests in studying or recruiting prospects.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.2.1, page 72, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.1.2.1 Talent Scout. *An institution may not pay any costs incurred by an athletics talent scout or a representative of its athletics interests in studying or recruiting prospects. An institution may not provide any such person a fee or honorarium and thereby claim the person as a staff member entitled to expense money.*"

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.2.1.1, page 72, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.1.2.1.1 Employment Prohibition. *An institution may not employ an individual for the primary purpose of recruiting or evaluating prospects and designate the individual as a coach if he or she does not reside in the institution's general locale. Such an individual would be considered an athletics talent scout rather than a regular institutional staff member.*"

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.2.1.2, page 72, as follows:

[Division III]

*"13.1.2.1.2 Expense Prohibition. An institution may not pay expenses (other than meals provided in the institution's home community) for representatives of its athletics interests to visit its campus for the purpose of becoming familiar with the institution's academic and athletics programs and campus facilities in order to represent the institution better when recruiting prospects. The provision of such expenses would be considered payment of costs incurred by athletics talent scouts."*

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The committee reviewed all of Bylaw 13.1.2 and determined that matters relating to institutional resources shall be subject to institutional decision and institutional control.

**Action:** Failed (paddle vote).

<b>NO. 70 (Dereg. 7)</b>	<b>EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS OF HIGH-SCHOOL/COLLEGE- PREPARATORY/TWO-YEAR COLLEGE COACHES</b>
--------------------------	---

**Intent:** To clarify legislation relating to the employment of a high-school, preparatory school or two-year-college coach by a member institution.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.9.3.1, page 81, as follows:  
[Division III]

*"13.9.3.1 Graduate Teaching Assistants. A high-school, preparatory school or two-year college coach who is enrolled in a bona fide post-graduate program at a member institution is permitted to receive legitimate compensation as a graduate teaching assistant."*

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.9.3.2, page 81, as follows:  
[Division III]

*"13.9.3.2 Employment in Different Sport. A high-school, preparatory school or two-year college coach who remains associated with the high school, preparatory school or two-year college in a coaching capacity in a different sport shall be permitted to engage in part-time employment as a member of an institution's coaching staff."*

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 13.9.3.3, page 81, as follows:  
[Division III]

*"13.9.3.3 Employment in Same Sport. A high-school, preparatory school or two-year college coach who remains associated with the high school, preparatory school or two-year college in a coaching capacity in the same sport may be employed as a member of an institution's coaching staff."*

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 13.9.3.3.1, page 81, as follows:

[Division III]

*"13.9.3.3.1 Conditions and Restrictions. A high-school, preparatory school or two-year college coach employed by an institution under this provision must perform actual on-the-field coaching duties, may be involved in recruiting only to the extent of such involvement by the institution's other on-the-field coaches, and must be under contract or other binding agreement for a period of not less than one academic year; however, the institution is permitted to confine such a coach's compensation to a shorter period of time (e.g., a sport season)."*

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 11.4 by adding new 11.4.3, page 53, as follows:

[Division III]

**"11.4.3 Employment in Same or Different Sport. A high-school, preparatory school or two-year college coach who remains associated with the high school, preparatory school or a two-year college in the same or different sport may be employed by an institution."**

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The committee agreed that this proposal will clarify the legislation relating to the employment of a high-school, preparatory school or a two-year college coach by a member institution. The committee also agreed that this legislation is more appropriately found in Bylaw 11.4 as opposed to Bylaw 13. The application of the current legislation is not changed by this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

#### **NO. 71 (Dereg. 8)**

#### **PUBLICITY – ANNOUNCER FOR HIGH-SCHOOL BROADCAST**

**Intent:** To eliminate the restriction on a member of an institution's coaching staff serving as an announcer or commentator for a high-school broadcast.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.11.3.1, page 82, as follows:

[Division III]

*"13.11.3.1 Announcer for High-School Broadcast. A member of the athletics staff of a member institution may not serve as an announcer or commentator for a high-school, college preparatory school or two-year college contest, or appear (in person or by means of film, audio tape or videotape) on a radio or television broadcast of such contest. In Division III, this restriction applies only to members of an institution's coaching staff (e.g., full-time, part-time, volunteer). This restriction does not apply to contests involving national teams in which prospective student-athletes may be participants, including the Olympic games."*

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The committee agreed that this bylaw is unnecessary in that the applicable regulations with regard to pertaining to recruiting activities by a member of the athletics staff already exist in this bylaw.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

**NO. 72 (Dereg. 9)      TRYOUTS – COMPETITION IN  
CONJUNCTION WITH A HIGH SCHOOL,  
PREPARATORY SCHOOL OR TWO-  
YEAR COLLEGE**

**Intent:** To clarify legislation relating to intercollegiate competition in conjunction with a high school, preparatory school or two-year college contest.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.12.1.3, page 83, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.12.1.3 Competition in Conjunction with a High School, Preparatory School or Two-Year College. **A** member institutions *shall be permitted to* **may** host such competition **between or among high schools, preparatory schools or two-year colleges to be conducted in conjunction with collegiate athletics event, provided.** *In Division III and in the Division II sports of basketball, football, gymnastics and volleyball, all high schools, preparatory schools or two-year colleges* **the schools** involved *must be* **are** located within a 50-mile radius of the member institution hosting the event and all such competition must occur on the member institution's campus. **Further, the collegiate athletics event may be conducted during a continuous session on the same day as the high school, preparatory school or two-year college contest under a single admission."**

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.12.1.3.1, page 83, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.12.1.3.1 *Criteria. A member institution may schedule an intercollegiate contest on the same day as a high-school, preparatory school or two-year college contest under a single admission and conducted during a continuous session."*

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The committee agreed that the legislation relating to collegiate competition in conjunction with a high school, preparatory school or two-year college contest is extremely confusing and difficult to follow. This proposal is an attempt to clarify this legislation.

Current legislation will not be changed by this proposal, only clarified.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

### **NO. 73 (Dereg. 10) CAMPS AND CLINICS – EMPLOYMENT AND COMPENSATION**

**Intent:** To eliminate specified prohibitions on employment and compensation of a high school, preparatory school or two-year college coach employed in an institutional sport camp or clinic.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.13.2.2.1, page 86, as follows:  
[Division III]

"13.13.2.2.1 General Rule. A member institution (or employees of its athletics department) may employ a high-school, preparatory school or two-year college coach at its camp or clinic, *provided*:.  
"

"(a) *The coach receives compensation that is commensurate with the going rate for camp counselors of like teaching ability and camp experience, and*  
"

"(b) *The coach is not paid on the basis of the value the coach may have for the employer because of the coach's reputation or contact with prospects.*"

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.13.2.2.2, page 86, as follows:  
[Division III]

"13.13.2.2.2 *Prohibited Compensation. A member institution may not compensate or reimburse a high-school, preparatory school or two-year college coach based on the number of campers the coach sends to the camp.*"

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The committee has recommended the adoption of a new general principle, which specifies that the institution has complete control over who is to be employed and the amount of salary to be paid to that employee in accordance with institutional policy. Thus, these restrictions are no longer necessary.

**Action:** Adopted, 186-144-9.

### **NO. 74 (Dereg. 11) HIGH SCHOOL ALL-STAR GAMES – PREVIOUS CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT**

**Intent:** To eliminate the requirement that a coach who has made a contractual commitment to a coach in a high school all-star game prior to being employed by an institution must disassociate himself or herself from that all-star game.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.14.1.1, page 87, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.14.1.1 **Exception** – Previous Contractual Agreement. If a coach has made a contractual commitment to coach in a high-school all-star game prior to being employed by a member institution and then becomes a member of the institution's staff before the game is held, the coach *shall be obligated to observe this provision and disassociate himself or herself from the all-star game* **may honor the contractual commitment.**"

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Adoption of this legislation will permit a coach who has made a contractual commitment prior to being employed by a member institution to honor that commitment as long as the coach observes applicable recruiting legislation. It remains otherwise impermissible for a member institution's coach to coach in a high school all-star game.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

#### **NO. 75 (Dereg. 12) PUBLISHED RECRUITING SERVICES**

**Intent:** To eliminate the requirement that a published recruiting service utilized by an institution must make the service available to all institutions and charge the same rate for all subscribers.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.15.3.1, page 87, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.15.3.1 *Published Recruiting Services. An institution may subscribe to a regularly published scouting service involving prospects, provided this service is made available to all institutions desiring to subscribe and at the same fee rate for all subscribers.*"

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Further, this proposal will eliminate the need for institutions to research whether the recruiting service is available to all subscribers at the same rate. The adoption of this proposal would eliminate this unnecessary compliance activity.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

#### **NO. 76 (Dereg. 13) POSTSEASON FOOTBALL**

**Intent:** To eliminate the restrictions on postseason football opportunities set forth in Bylaws 18.02.4 and 18.7.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 18.02.4, page 209, as follows:

[Division III]

*"18.02.4 Postseason Football Bowl Game. A postseason football bowl game is a football contest conducted after the regular football season and involving two teams selected because of their regular-season performance (e.g., won-lost record, conference championship). Participation in such events by member institutions is limited to those bowl games that are certified by the Association per 18.7 and 30.9."*

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 18.7, page 214, as follows:

[Division III]

**"18.7 POSTSEASON FOOTBALL**

*"18.7.1 Permissible Football Games. The only football games in which a member institution may compete are:*

*"(a) Games scheduled as to the identity of a participating college before the beginning of the regular football season of the institution for any academic year, including not only games for which the identity of one participating college is known, but also one for which the institution's opponent is not known at the time of scheduling;*

*"(b) Any football game scheduled between two colleges [which is to be played on a common and regular open date (as defined in 18.02.3) of their regular football seasons, on the campus or in the regular playing stadium of either team], even if it is scheduled after the beginning of either participant's football season;*

*"(c) Games that are part of the NCAA championships for Division I-AA, Division II and Division III members;*

*"(d) Games that are part of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics football championships;*

*"(e) A conference championship game on an open date during the traditional fall season, provided the game is played (as opposed to scheduled) the week prior to the first round of an NCAA football championship date and provided the game is listed on the schedules of all conference members; and*

*"(f) Certified postseason bowl games that meet all requirements and conditions set forth in 30.9.*

*"18.7.1.1 Institutional Eligibility—Written Report. The director of athletics of a member institution that participates in a postseason bowl game shall submit by the subsequent February 1 a written report on the event as specified in 30.9.1."*

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** The committee agreed that the removal of this language would not open the door for potential abuse as institutions are still



subject to the playing and practice season legislation relating to football (i.e., permissible number of contests, length of playing season, number of contests) set forth in Bylaw 17.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

## **NO. 77 (Dereg. 14) FOOTBALL TELEVISION PLANS AND REGULATIONS**

**Intent:** To delete the football television plans and regulations set forth in Bylaw 22.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 22.01, page 249, as follows:

[Division III]

### **"22.01 GENERAL PRINCIPLE**

*"The telecasting, cablecasting or otherwise televising of intercollegiate football games of member institutions may be subject to the provisions enacted by the Association."*

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 22.02, page 249, as follows:

[Division III]

### **"22.02 DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS**

*"22.02.1 National Telecast or Cablecast. A national telecast or cablecast is a release on a single date of a live game or games telecast or cablecast by a single television network, syndicator or programming entity into markets containing at least 20 million homes in at least 30 states, or containing at least 50 percent of the USA television homes as reported by the annual edition of Television and Cable Factbook (and all updates thereto issued prior to August 1 of the year in which the game or games are played)."*

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 22.1, page 249, as follows:

[Division III]

### **"22.1 FOOTBALL TELEVISION PLANS**

*"The telecasting, cablecasting or otherwise televising of member institutions' intercollegiate football games during the regular football season may be conducted pursuant to voluntary television plans for one or more of the divisions (i.e., Divisions I, II and III). Such plans may be prepared from time to time by the Management Council and approved by majority vote of those voting in the respective divisions (see 22.1.1)."*

*"22.1.1 Division Control. Each division shall determine its own procedure for the formulation and adoption of any television plan. Majority approval is required within each division before a plan may be adopted by that division. The majority approval of a Division I plan shall require a majority vote of Division I-A representatives on the Board of Directors present and voting as well as a majority of Division I-A and Division I-AA representatives on the Board of Directors present and voting together. The*

*members of a division may approve such a plan by mail referendum (see 5.3.11.3)."*

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 22.2, page 249, as follows:

[Division III]

**"22.2 FOOTBALL TELECAST/CABLECAST REGULATIONS**

*"Regardless of whether a division adopts a football television plan for a particular season, all forms of telecasting, cablecasting or otherwise televising of the intercollegiate football games of member institutions during the regular football season shall be governed by the following:*

*"22.2.1 Simultaneous Telecast/Cablecast of Friday Night Games. There shall be no simultaneous telecasting or cablecasting of regular-season intercollegiate football games on Friday nights. Any afternoon football telecast or cablecast on Friday must be completed by 7 p.m. local time in each location in which the program is received.*

*"22.2.2 Mutual Consent for Telecast/Cablecast of Games. A member institution shall not be obligated to telecast or cablecast any of its intercollegiate football games, home or away. A member institution may not make any commitment for the simultaneous or delayed telecasting or cablecasting of any game without the prior written consent of its opponent institution.*

*"22.2.3 Assessment against National Telecast/Cablecast Gross Rights Fee. The gross rights fee paid to each member institution for a national telecast or cablecast of an intercollegiate football game shall be subject to an assessment of 4 percent, paid by the home institution to the NCAA to fund the costs of the NCAA postgraduate scholarship program and football-related services performed by the NCAA.*

*"22.2.3.1 Waiver. The Executive Committee shall have the authority to waive this assessment on an annual basis."*

**Source:** NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Interpretations and Legislation Committee)].

**Effective Date:** August 1, 2001.

**Rationale:** Inasmuch as there are limited television opportunities for Division III institutions, the committee agreed that Bylaw 22 serves no purpose other than to hinder those opportunities.

**Action:** Adopted (paddle vote).

**2001 NCAA Convention  
Division II Voting Results  
Page 1**

	Proposal 12	Proposal 13	Proposal 15	Proposal 16	Proposal 17	Proposal 18	Proposal 19	Proposal 20	Proposal 21	Proposal 22	Proposal 23	Proposal 24	Proposal 25	Proposal 26	Proposal 27-1	Proposal 27
Abilene Christian University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Adams State College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Adelphi University	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N		N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Albany State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Alderson-Broaddus College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
American International College	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
American Univ. of Puerto Rico	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Anderson College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Angelo State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Arkansas Tech University	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Armstrong Atlantic State Univ.	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ashland University		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Assumption College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Augusta State University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Augustana College (SD)	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Barry University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Barton College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bellarmino College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Belmont Abbey College																
Bemidji State University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y
Bentley College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bloomsburg University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Bluefield State College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bowie State University																
Brigham Young University (HI)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bryant College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
C.W. Post Campus/Long Island	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Calif. State Polytechnic Univ.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Calif. State U.-San Bernardino	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Calif. State U.-Dominguez Hills	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Calif. State Univ.-Bakersfield	Y	Y	Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
Calif. State Univ.-Chico	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Calif. State Univ.-Los Angeles	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Calif. State Univ.-Stanislaus	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y							Y	Y	Y	Y
California University (PA)																
Cameron University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Carson-Newman College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Catawba College	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Central Missouri State Univ.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Central Washington Univ.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Chadron State College	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Chaminade University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cheyney University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Christian Brothers University	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y
Clarion University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Clark Atlanta University																



**2001 NCAA Convention  
Division II Voting Results  
Page 3**

[illegible]

2001 NCAA Convention  
Division II Voting Results  
Page 4

	Proposal 12	Proposal 13	Proposal 15	Proposal 16	Proposal 17	Proposal 18	Proposal 19	Proposal 20	Proposal 21	Proposal 22	Proposal 23	Proposal 24	Proposal 25	Proposal 26	Proposal 27-1	Proposal 27
Northeastern State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Northern Kentucky University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northern Michigan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northern State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northwest Missouri State Univ.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Northwood University	A	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Oakland City University																
Oklahoma Panhandle St Univ	Y	N	Y	Y												
Ouachita Baptist University	N	N		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pace University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Paine College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pfeiffer University																
Philadelphia University	N	N	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pittsburg State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Presbyterian College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Queens College (NC)																
Queens College (NY)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Quincy University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Regis University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rockhurst University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rollins College	Y	N					Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saginaw Valley State Univ.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Anselm College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Joseph's College (IN)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Saint Leo University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Salem International University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
San Francisco State University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Savannah State University																
Seattle Pacific University	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Shaw University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Shepherd College	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Shippensburg University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
Slippery Rock University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Sonoma State University	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
South Dakota State University	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Southampton College of LIU	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southeastern Okla St Univ	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
Southern Arkansas University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern Connecticut St. Univ.	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Southern Illinois University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southwest Baptist University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southwest State University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southwestern Oklahoma St. Univ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Andrews Presbyterian Coll.																
St. Augustine's College																
St. Cloud State University	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N

2001 NCAA Convention  
Division II Voting Results  
Page 5

	Proposal 12	Proposal 13	Proposal 15	Proposal 16	Proposal 17	Proposal 18	Proposal 19	Proposal 20	Proposal 21	Proposal 22	Proposal 23	Proposal 24	Proposal 25	Proposal 26	Proposal 27-1	Proposal 27
St. Edward's University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Martin's College																
St. Mary's University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
St. Michael's College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
St. Paul's College	Y	A		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State Univ of NY at Binghamton																
State Univ. of West Georgia																
Stonehill College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Tarleton State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Texas A&M Univ.-Kingsville	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Texas A&M University-Commerce	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Texas Lutheran University																
Texas Wesleyan University	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Texas Woman's University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
The College of Saint Rose	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N
The University of Charleston																
Truman State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	N
Tusculum College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Tuskegee University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
U. of So. Carolina-Spartanburg	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Univ of District of Columbia	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Univ of Southern Colorado																
Univ. of Alabama-Huntsville	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Univ. of Arkansas-Monticello																
Univ. of California-Davis	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Univ. of California-Riverside																
Univ. of California-San Diego	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Univ. of Central Arkansas	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Univ. of Colorado-Colo Springs	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Univ. of Massachusetts-Lowell	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Univ. of Missouri-St. Louis	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Univ. of Nebraska at Kearney	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Univ. of Northern Colorado	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Univ. of South Carolina-Aiken	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Univ. of Southern Indiana	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Univ. of the Incarnate Word	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Univ. of Wisconsin-Parkside	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Alaska Anchorage	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Alaska Fairbanks	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Bridgeport	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Central Oklahoma	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Findlay	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
University of Hawaii-Hilo	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Indianapolis	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Minnesota-Duluth	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Minnesota-Morris	N	N	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

2001 NCAA Convention  
Division II Voting Results  
Page 6

	Proposal 12	Proposal 13	Proposal 15	Proposal 16	Proposal 17	Proposal 18	Proposal 19	Proposal 20	Proposal 21	Proposal 22	Proposal 23	Proposal 24	Proposal 25	Proposal 26	Proposal 27-1	Proposal 27
University of Missouri-Rolla	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
University of Montevallo	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Nebraska-Omaha	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
University of New Haven	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of North Alabama	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of North Carolina	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
University of North Dakota	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
University of North Florida	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
University of Pittsburgh	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
University of South Dakota	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Tampa	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of West Alabama	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of West Florida	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Valdosta State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y
Virginia State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Virginia Union University	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Washburn University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wayne State College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wayne State University (MI)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Chester University	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
West Liberty State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Texas A&M University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
West Virg. Univ Insti of Tech					Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Virginia State College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Virginia Wesleyan College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Western New Mexico University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Western Oregon University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Western State College	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Western Washington Univ	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Westminster College (PA)																
Wheeling Jesuit University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wingate University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Winona State University	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Winston-Salem State Univ.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y
Calif. Collegiate Ath. Assn.	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Carolinas-Virginia Athl Conf	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Central Intercol. Ath. Assn.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
The Heartland Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New York Collegiate Athl Conf	N	N			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
No. Central Intercol Ath Conf	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
South Atlantic Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Great Lakes Intercol Ath Conf	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Great Lakes Valley Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gulf South Conference	Y	N	Y	N	Y											N
Lone Star Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mid-America Inter. Ath. Assn.	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	A	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y



2001 NCAA Convention  
Division II Voting Results  
Page 7

	Proposal 12	Proposal 13	Proposal 15	Proposal 16	Proposal 17	Proposal 18	Proposal 19	Proposal 20	Proposal 21	Proposal 22	Proposal 23	Proposal 24	Proposal 25	Proposal 26	Proposal 27-1	Proposal 27
Northeast-10 Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		N
Northern Sun Inter. Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pacific West Conference	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Peach Belt Athletic Conference																
Pennsylvania State Athl Conf	Y	N	Y		Y	Y		A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conf	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Southern Intercol. Ath. Conf.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sunshine State Conference	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y
West Virg. Intercol Athl. Conf	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>Yes</b>	217	116	229	201	243	232	215	200	238	218	227	227	238	243	199	198
<b>No</b>	29	133	14	41	3	14	28	42	8	29	18	20	6	4	42	51
<b>Abstain</b>	2	2	1	2	0	1	0	5	1	0	1	1	1	2	6	0
<b>Not Present</b>	37	34	41	41	39	38	42	38	38	38	39	37	40	36	38	36

	Proposal 46-1	Proposal 46-2	Proposal 46	Proposal 47	Proposal 48	Motion to refer Prop 49	Proposal 49	Proposal 50	Proposal 51	Proposal 52	Proposal 53 (football only)	Proposal 54 (football only)	Proposal 73	Motion to Reconsider Prop. 49
Adrian College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Agnes Scott College														
Albertus Magnus College		Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	A	N	Y			N	N
Albion College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Albright College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Alfred University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Allegheny College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Allentown College			Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			N	Y
Alvernia College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Amherst College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y	N	Y	A	N
Anderson University			Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Anna Maria College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Augsburg College		Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Augustana College (IL)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	A	N	Y	N	N	A	Y
Aurora University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Averett College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	A	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Babson College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y			Y	Y
Baldwin-Wallace College	N	Y		Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Bard College			Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Bates College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Beaver College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y			Y	N
Beloit College														
Benedictine University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bennett College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			N	Y
Bethany College (WV)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Bethel College (MN)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Blackburn College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Bluffton College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Bowdoin College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Brandeis University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y	Y			Y	Y
Bridgewater College (VA)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Bridgewater State College (MA)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Brooklyn College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y			N	Y
Bryn Mawr College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y			Y	Y
Buena Vista University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Cabrini College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Calif. Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y			N	N
Calif. State Univ.-Hayward	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N			N	Y
California Lutheran University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
Calvin College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y		Y	N	N				N

	Proposal 46-1	Proposal 46-2	Proposal 46	Proposal 47	Proposal 48	Motion to refer Prop 49	Proposal 49	Proposal 50	Proposal 51	Proposal 52	Proposal 53 (football only)	Proposal 54 (football only)	Proposal 73	Motion to Reconsider Prop. 49
Capital University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Carleton College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Carnegie Mellon University	Y		Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	A	N	N
Carthage College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Case Western Reserve Univ.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Castleton State College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	
Catholic University (DC)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		N	Y	N	N	N	N
Cazenovia College	Y	Y		N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	
Centenary College (NJ)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Central College (IA)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Centre College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Chapman University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y		
Chatham College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y			N	Y
Chowan College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Christopher Newport University														
City College of New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	
Claremont-Mudd-Scripps College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Clark University (MA)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y			N	N
Clarke College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Clarkson University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y			N	Y
Colby College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	N
Colby-Sawyer College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y			Y	N
College Misericordia	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y			N	Y
College of Mount St. Joseph	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
College of Mount St. Vincent														
College of New Rochelle	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y			A	N
College of Notre Dame-Maryland	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
College of St. Benedict	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		N	Y			Y	Y
College of St. Catherine	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y				Y
College of Staten Island	Y	Y	Y	A	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			N	
College of Wooster	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	A	N	N	N
Concordia College (MN)			Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Concordia University (IL)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Concordia University (WI)														
Concordia University at Austin	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Cornell College (IA)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Curry College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Daniel Webster College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y			N	N
De Pauw University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	
Defiance College		Y	N	N	N	Y	N		Y	Y	N	N	N	Y

	Proposal 46-1	Proposal 46-2	Proposal 46	Proposal 47	Proposal 48	Motion to refer Prop 49	Proposal 49	Proposal 50	Proposal 51	Proposal 52	Proposal 53 (football only)	Proposal 54 (football only)	Proposal 73	Motion to Reconsider Prop. 49
Delaware Valley College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Denison University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	A	N	N	Y
Dickinson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Drew University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y				N
Earlham College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	A	Y	Y	Y
Eastern College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y			N	Y
Eastern Conn. State Univ.	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y		Y	Y			N	Y
Eastern Mennonite University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	Y
Eastern Nazarene College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Eastern Oregon University			Y	N		Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Edgewood College														
Elizabethtown College		Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Elmhurst College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Elmira College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y			N	
Emerson College	Y	Y		N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y			N	N
Emmanuel College														
Emory & Henry College														
Emory University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N			Y	Y
Endicott College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Eureka College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Fairleigh Dickinson-Madison	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Ferrum College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Fitchburg State College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Framingham State College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Franklin & Marshall College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Franklin College		Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Frostburg State University														
Gallaudet University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
George Fox University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Gettysburg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Gordon College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Goucher College	Y	Y		Y	N	A	A	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Greensboro College	Y		Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Greenville College	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Grinnell College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
Grove City College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Guilford College														
Gustavus Adolphus College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Gwynedd-Mercy College														
Hamilton College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N

	Proposal 46-1	Proposal 46-2	Proposal 46	Proposal 47	Proposal 48	Motion to refer Prop 49	Proposal 49	Proposal 50	Proposal 51	Proposal 52	Proposal 53 (football only)	Proposal 54 (football only)	Proposal 73	Motion to Reconsider Prop. 49
Hamline University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Hampden-Sydney College	Y		Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Hanover College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Hardin-Simmons University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hartwick College	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	
Heidelberg College														
Hendrix College			Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Hilbert College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	
Hiram College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Hobart & Wm. Smith Colleges	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Hollins University	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	A	Y	N	N			Y	A
Hood College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y			N	Y
Hope College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Howard Payne University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hunter College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y			N	Y
Illinois College														
Illinois Wesleyan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Ithaca College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
John Carroll University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
John Jay College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y				
Johns Hopkins University		Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Johnson & Wales University	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y		N	Y			Y	Y
Juniata College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Kalamazoo College				N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Kean University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Keene State College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y			N	Y
Kenyon College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	A	Y	N	Y
King's College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Knox College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
La Roche College		Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Lake Erie College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Lake Forest College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
Lakeland College														
Lasell College		Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y			N	N
Lawrence University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Lebanon Valley College	Y		Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		
Lewis & Clark College	Y		Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Lincoln University (PA)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y				N
Linfield College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Loras College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y

	Proposal 46-1	Proposal 46-2	Proposal 46	Proposal 47	Proposal 48	Motion to refer Prop 49	Proposal 49	Proposal 50	Proposal 51	Proposal 52	Proposal 53 (football only)	Proposal 54 (football only)	Proposal 73	Motion to Reconsider Prop. 49
Luther College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y	N	N	N	N
Lynchburg College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N			Y	N
Macalester College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	A	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Manchester College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Manhattanville College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Maranatha Baptist Bible	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	
Marian College (WI)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	
Marietta College	Y			N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Mary Washington College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y			N	
Maryville Univ. of Saint Louis	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			N	Y
Marywood University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y			Y	N
Mass. College of Liberal Arts	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y			N	N
Mass. Institute of Technology	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Medgar Evers College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			N	Y
Messiah College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Methodist College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Middlebury College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Millikin University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Mills College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y			N	Y
Millsaps College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	
Montclair State University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Moravian College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Mount Holyoke College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y					N	N
Mount Saint Mary College (NY)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y			Y	
Mount Union College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y		Y
Muhlenberg College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Nazareth College (NY)	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			N	Y
Nebraska Wesleyan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Neumann College	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N			N	N
New England College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y			N	Y
New Jersey City University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
New York University		Y		N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y			Y	N
Nichols College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
North Central College														
North Park University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	A	N
Norwich University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Oberlin College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	A	Y	N	N
Oglethorpe University	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N			N	N
Ohio Northern University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Ohio Wesleyan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N

	Proposal 46-1	Proposal 46-2	Proposal 46	Proposal 47	Proposal 48	Motion to refer Prop 49	Proposal 49	Proposal 50	Proposal 51	Proposal 52	Proposal 53 (football only)	Proposal 54 (football only)	Proposal 73	Motion to Reconsider Prop. 49
Olivet College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Otterbein College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Pacific Lutheran University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pacific University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Penn. State Univ.-Behrend Coll	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Plattsburgh State University	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	N
Plymouth State College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Polytechnic University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y				
Pomona-Pitzer Colleges	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	A		N	Y	N	N	Y	A
Ramapo College of New Jersey	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Randolph-Macon College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Randolph-Macon Woman's Coll.	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N			Y	
Regis College (MA)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y			Y	N
Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst.	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Rhode Island College	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y			Y	Y
Rhodes College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y			N	
Richard Stockton Coll of NJ	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Rivier College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y				
Roanoke College	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N			N	N
Rochester Institute of Tech.	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y			N	N
Rockford College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
Roger Williams University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	Y
Rose-Hulman Institute of Tech.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	
Rosemont College	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N			N	N
Rowan University	Y	Y		N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Russell Sage College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y			N	Y
Rust College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Rutgers University-Newark	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	N
Saint Joseph College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	A	Y	Y	N	Y			Y	
Saint Mary's College (IN)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			N	Y
Salem State College	Y	Y		N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Salisbury State University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Salve Regina University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Savannah Col. of Art & Design	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y			Y	N
Simpson College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Skidmore College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			N	Y
Smith College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N			Y	Y
Southern Vermont College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y			N	N
Southwestern University (TX)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Springfield College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	

	Proposal 46-1	Proposal 46-2	Proposal 46	Proposal 47	Proposal 48	Motion to refer Prop 49	Proposal 49	Proposal 50	Proposal 51	Proposal 52	Proposal 53 (football only)	Proposal 54 (football only)	Proposal 73	Motion to Reconsider Prop. 49
St. John Fisher College	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y			
St. John's University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
St. Joseph's College-Suffolk	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y			N	Y
St. Lawrence University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
St. Mary's College of Maryland	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
St. Mary's University of Minn.	Y	Y		Y	N	Y	N	Y					Y	Y
St. Olaf College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
St. Univ College @ Oswego	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y			N	N
St. Univ. College @ Fredonia	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	A	Y	Y			N	N
St. Univ. College @ Oneonta	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y			Y	N
State Univ College @ Cortland	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
State Univ College @ Geneseo	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y			Y	N
State Univ College @ New Paltz	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y			Y	N
State Univ College @ Potsdam	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
State Univ. College at Buffalo	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	Y
Stephens College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y				
Stevens Institute of Tech	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			N	Y
Stillman College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Suffolk University	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y			N	Y
Sul Ross State University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Suny College at Brockport	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
SUNY Maritime College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y			Y	
Susquehanna University	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Swarthmore College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	A			
Sweet Briar College	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N			Y	N
The College of New Jersey	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y
The University of Scranton	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Thiel College	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	
Trinity College (CT)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
Trinity College (DC)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y			N	Y
Trinity University (TX)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Tufts University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
U.S. Coast Guard Academy	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy	Y	Y		N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Union College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Univ of Pittsburgh @ Bradford	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Univ. of Mary Hardin-Baylor	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Univ. of Mass.-Dartmouth	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Univ. of Massachusetts-Boston	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	N
Univ. of Southern Maine	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			N	Y



	Proposal 46-1	Proposal 46-2	Proposal 46	Proposal 47	Proposal 48	Motion to refer Prop 49	Proposal 49	Proposal 50	Proposal 51	Proposal 52	Proposal 53 (football only)	Proposal 54 (football only)	Proposal 73	Motion to Reconsider Prop. 49
Univ. of Wisconsin-Eau Claire	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Univ. of Wisconsin-La Crosse	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Univ. of Wisconsin-Oshkosh	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Univ. of Wisconsin-Platteville	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Univ. of Wisconsin-River Falls	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Univ. of Wisconsin-Stevens Pnt	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Univ. of Wisconsin-Stout	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Univ. of Wisconsin-Superior	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Univ. of Wisconsin-Whitewater	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
University of Chicago	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
University of Dallas	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y			N	N
University of Dubuque	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
University of La Verne	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	A	N	N	Y
University of Maine-Farmington	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	
University of New England	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
University of Puget Sound	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	A	N
University of Redlands	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
University of Rochester	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
University of St. Thomas	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
University of the Ozarks	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	N
University of the South	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	
Upper Iowa University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Ursinus College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Utica College	Y	Y	Y	A	N	N	N	Y	N	Y			Y	N
Vassar College	Y	Y	Y	N		N	N	Y	N	Y			Y	Y
Villa Julie College	Y	Y	Y	N	N									
Virginia Wesleyan College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Wabash College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Wartburg College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		Y
Washington & Jefferson College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Washington & Lee University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Washington College (MD)	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y			Y	N
Washington University (MO)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Waynesburg College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Webster University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y			N	Y
Wellesley College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N			Y	N
Wells College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y			N	Y
Wentworth Institute of Tech.	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Wesley College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Wesleyan College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y			Y	N

	Proposal 46-1	Proposal 46-2	Proposal 46	Proposal 47	Proposal 48	Motion to refer Prop 49	Proposal 49	Proposal 50	Proposal 51	Proposal 52	Proposal 53 (football only)	Proposal 54 (football only)	Proposal 73	Motion to Reconsider Prop. 49
Wesleyan University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Western Conn. State Univ.	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Western Maryland College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Western New England College	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Westfield State College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Westminster College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	A	N	N	Y
Wheaton College (IL)	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		N	N
Wheaton College (MA)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	N	Y			Y	N
Whitman College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		Y	Y			Y	N
Whittier College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Whitworth College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Wilkes University	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	N	Y
Willamette University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	A
William Paterson Univ. of NJ	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Williams College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Wilmington College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	
Wilson College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y			N	Y
Wisconsin Lutheran College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Wittenberg University	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	A	N	Y	Y
Worcester Polytechnic Inst.	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N
Worcester State College	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
York College	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	N
Atlantic Women's Colleges Conf	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y			N	Y
Capital Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	A	N		Y	N	Y	Y			Y	N
Centennial Conference	Y	Y		N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y			N	Y
City Univ of NY Athletic Conf	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			N	N
College Conf. of Ill. & Wisc.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y			Y	N
Commonwealth Coast Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Dixie Intercol. Athletic Conf.	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Empire Eight	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y			A	Y
Great Northeast Athl Conf	Y		A		Y	Y		A		Y				N
Heartland Collegiate Athl Conf	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y		Y	Y			Y	Y
Little East Conference	Y	Y	Y		N	N	N		Y					Y
Mass. State College Ath. Conf.	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y			Y	N
Michigan Intercol. Ath. Assn.	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			N	Y
Middle Atlantic Conf.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Midwest Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y			Y	N
Minn. Intercol. Ath. Conf.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y			Y	N
New England Sm Coll Ath Conf	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		N	Y			A	N
New Jersey Athletic Conference	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y

	Proposal 46-1	Proposal 46-2	Proposal 46	Proposal 47	Proposal 48	Motion to refer Prop 49	Proposal 49	Proposal 50	Proposal 51	Proposal 52	Proposal 53 (football only)	Proposal 54 (football only)	Proposal 73	Motion to Reconsider Prop. 49
North Coast Athletic Conf.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N			A	Y
Northern Illinois-Iowa Conf.	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y			N	Y
Northwest Conference	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y		Y	Y			Y	N
Ohio Athletic Conference	Y	Y		Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y
Old Dominion Athletic Conf.	Y	Y	Y	A	N	N	Y	Y	A	Y			N	N
Pennsylvania Athletic Conf.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y			N	N
So. Calif. Intercol. Ath. Conf	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
Southern Collegiate Ath. Conf.	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	N
St. Louis Intercol. Ath. Conf.	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y			N	Y
State Univ. of NY Ath. Conf.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N			N	N
University Athletic Assn.		Y	Y	N	N	Y	A	A	A	N			Y	Y
Upstate Collegiate Athl Assn	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y			N	
Wisc Intercollegiate Athl Conf	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y				
<b>Yes</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>168</b>
<b>Abstain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>341</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>322</b>